DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 377 HE 000 620

Residential College Concept in American Higher Education.
North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill.
Spons Agency-Reynolds (Z. Smith) Foundation.
Pub Date 67
Note-83p.; Proceedings of a conference held under the auspices of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, October 13-14, 1967
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.25

"The residential college concept is a symbol--a vital symbol--of a much larger concern, the humanization of student life and of American life in general." This conference was held to consider the residential college concept as a means of furthering the emotional and intellectual development of students. Nevitt Sanford, Dana L. Farnsworth, and D. Gordon Rohman discussed the philosophical basis, the nature, and various types of existing residential colleges. It was generally agreed by them and other conference participants that every university must develop its own plan for residential colleges, based on its own desires, capacities, and limitations. It was also felt that the questions of coeducation, faculty participation, and curricular change can be handled in a variety of ways and that none of these need be regarded as essential to a residential college system. Reference is made to numerous problems and practices encountered in universities across the country. The growth of residential colleges at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, is described. Copies of this report are available from Residential College Development Program, 302 Bynum Hall, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina ($2.00). (JS)

ED030377

RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE CONCEPT

in

AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Proceedings of a Conference
Held under the auspices of the

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

October 13 - 14, 1967

Made possible by a grant from the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation

HE000 620

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO THE CONFERENCE
Samuel S. Hill, Jr. 1

COLLEGE, CULTURE, AND CHARACTER
Nevitt Sanford 2

THE QUALITY OF LIFE WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY
Dana L. Farnsworth 21

THE TWO CLOCKS OF JUSTIN MORRILL
D. Gordon Rohman 38

PANEL DISCUSSION
Jed Dietz, Glen Elder, Daniel Patterson 56

SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS 68

CONFERENCE LEADERSHIP 71

CHANCELLOR'S COMMITTEE ON RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES 72

PARTICIPANTS 73

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE
DEVELOPMENT AT UNC 78

INTRODUCTION TO THE CONFERENCE

Samuel S. Hill

We welcome you in order to exploit you. We at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill need help. I suspect each of you representing your particular campus could say exactly the same thing. We were quite selfish in calling this conference. We want all the help we can get, all the light shed on our problems that we can possibly arrange. Hence the conference; hence your presence.

Now to put teeth in what I am saying let me quote from today's Daily Tar Heel. These are the two lead paragraphs of a story on the front page of today's Daily Tar Heel, the caption of which reads "Residential Colleges Put Hopes on Meet": "UNC is hanging many of its hopes for better student living and more effective learning on a two-day conference on residence colleges this weekend in Durham." "As host of the 15 visiting colleges and universities, Carolina hopes to get fresh ideas about what can be done to improve the dormitory student's lot and to get greater faculty and administration interest and participation." We are delighted to have you for this reason.

I suppose exploitation ceases to be immoral when it becomes generally advantageous, and that, I would like to hope, is what we are here to do to and for one another. Surely we are all aware by now that the residential college concept is a symbol -- a vital symbol -- of a much larger concern, the humanization of student life and of American life in general. Surely this concept and its practice is of a piece with other national concerns, about which we in Chapel Hill recently had the good fortune of hearing the Honorable John Gardner speak. This is only one conference among a number of others called in recent years and indeed in this year to deal with this topic and related topics. One could mention the Cluster Colleges Conference in California last spring and the national conference at Bowling Green State University in Ohio.

We need during the next 24 hours your very freshest mind and imagination. Now, those of us who have had a say in planning this conference are priding ourselves in having located, sought, and got the three best possible speakers on our topic in the entire United States of America. How often have you planned a conference where you went for three top speakers and got your first three choices? This is exactly what happened to us on this occasion. It's a great pleasure to welcome these three speakers for our hearing over the next 24 hours.

COLLEGE, CULTURE, AND CHARACTER

Nevitt Sanford

I would begin by saying that residential arrangements for students definitely do make a difference. This we know. In Joseph Katz's volume on the Student Development Study at Stanford (No Time for Youth, Jossey-Bass, 1968), Marjorie M. Lozoff gives evidence that people who live in dormitories, fraternities, belong to eating clubs or live off campus actually have different developmental histories at Stanford. Ranked according to the degree of development that seems to occur, it would appear that men who live in fraternities all four years change the least in ways that people such as ourselves regard as desirable. Next would be people who live in dormitories, then the people who belong to eating clubs, while those who change the most are those who live off campus, especially those who move off mid-way in their college careers.

I want to suggest that whatever we do about residential arrangements makes a difference. If we should decide to have no residence halls on campus but just let students live as they wish and find their way to the university, that would be a decision and we could anticipate quite characteristic kinds of results. We know that students who live at home during their four years of college get less out of college than do people who live on campus. This means that educators cannot avoid responsibility for making decisions affecting residential arrangements. This being so, it seems to me that they must proceed according to a plan and that this plan must be based in a theory of education.

At the beginning of this conference it probably would be helpful to discuss the theory of education, leaving more detailed recommendations for later in the session. For me, a theory of education must embody a statement of aims and numerous statements concerning means and ends, ways in which we plan to promote or to further the aims that we have set forth. If the development of the whole person is the major goal -- as I would say it is -- then we must have a conception of the person and a theory of developmental change.

To speak first of aims, I am [illegible] that the fullest possible development of the individual person is the basic aim of undergraduate education. This conception includes education for social responsibility. A fully developed person is by definition a person who is prepared to make contributions to the society in which he lives.

Now this notion I believe is quite old fashioned, a part of a long tradition. It was stated in one way or another by the ancients, by the Greeks; and here in America it was reiterated forcefully by the Founding Fathers. However, I have found it difficult to find just the right quotations from the great educators and philosophers to suit my purposes. Most of them

---

Professor Sanford's visit was co-sponsored by the University of North Carolina School of Public Health.

up to and including Alfred North Whitehead use terms that are rather different from those we use today to characterize the individual or to describe the developed person, and it's not quite fair to quote them when you do not have the time to explain how their words differ from one's own.

The other day, however, in Alexander Mikeljohns' book What Does America Mean? I found something that appealed to me and is useful. He says that the really great ideas that we in this country have tried to follow, the real meaning of America, is to be found in the teachings of Socrates and Jesus. The ideals "Know thyself" and "Love thy neighbor as thyself" about cover the whole thing. It's interesting to translate these conceptions into psychological terms for they actually embody most of what I think we mean when we speak of the fullest possible development of the individual. In psychological terms it's easy to see that the two are very intimately related. In order to love another person well, one must know that person well. I would also add that in order to love another person well, one must also love oneself well, in the terms of Erich Fromm. Self respect is basic to love of another person for if one is to know others well, he must first know himself; the major sources of misconceptions and misapprehensions of other people come from a failure to admit into one's consciousness aspects of himself, as in "authoritarianism," which is marked by lack of love for one's neighbor and failure to know one's self.

I was struck the other day in reading the Chronicle of Higher Education that education for international relations is going to receive a big push in schools of education and teachers are going to be instructed in how they can educate children in the interest of better understanding among nations. This means a big push in favor of a curriculum that embodies a great deal of content about the various countries of the world. But this will do no good at all unless teachers in schools of education rethink how they regard themselves. The big failure in international relations comes not from a lack of knowledge of other countries, but from a lack of knowledge of ourselves, for what we reject and do not understand in ourselves is the major cause of our failure to understand other people.

When we come to the conception of the person, I suggest we regard him as highly complex, constituted of various dispositional, intellectual, emotional, and spiritual qualities which are really all of a piece, which function in concert. Intellectual development occurs in pace with development in the rest of the person, and vice versa.

I have found some good support for this notion recently in reading some of William James, whom I hadn't read for years, if at all. As a matter of fact, when I was a student at Harvard, James was already "out." He was not psychoanalytic enough for those of us on the psychodynamic side and he was not experimental enough for the academic psychologist, so we were encouraged not to read him. But he is now enjoying a new popularity. He is coming back into psychology. We had a symposium on James at the APA meetings this fall and it was in that connection that I read his biography by Allen and some of James himself. I was delighted to discover that I am a pragmatist in James' sense of the word. James' epistemology is really just what we need here. You see, James argued that in knowing the world, at the same time we have feelings about it. We make value judgments about it and have impulses to act accordingly. This is all of a piece and fundamental, so that abstracting the intellectual from the emotional or from the rest of the person is really a latter day psychological error designed to further experimental work rather than education or the good life. It's well to remember, too, that James embodied this view in himself as a man, and it's interesting to read in his biography the appreciation of James as a man and teacher by people who didn't agree with anything he had to say about psychology or philosophy. The thing about James that was most lasting was James the man, evidence of the truth of his claim that you can't separate a man from his work or from the way he actually perceives the world.

If we were to take this view seriously in education, it would have radical implications for the way we teach and for the kind of curricula we have. For if we are going to promote this kind of personal development, then we must have a theory about how developmental change actually occurs. To be fully committed, to love, to be capable of enjoying life are no more than potentialities in the child, and potentialities still, for the most part, in the college freshman. They have to be developed, and they have to be developed by us. They are not just going to flower by our leaving the student alone to come home in his own way.

Development takes place mainly through challenge. Children and little animals and college freshmen develop new capacities for response and sensitivities to different aspects of their environment through being challenged by the realization that their existing repertories of response are not adequate to deal with the situation they now confront. They must generate new types of response in order to manage, and if these new types of response prove effective, they become integrated in the person. This is how the personality expands and becomes more and more differentiated. Thus the task of holding the whole thing together becomes an important one, and is achieved mainly through self-consciousness and self-insight. These two developmental principles are fundamental in all education, including higher education.

Another point -- development proceeds according to an identifiable course or chain of events. Certain things have to happen before other things become possible. This permits us to speak of stages of development and to study the stage of development of the college freshman. We must take this into account in trying to plan for his living arrangements as well as other aspects of his education. The question is often put, is the college freshman an adult? He is likely to say he is; other people are likely to say he is not, and then all kinds of implications are likely to flow from this. If he is an adult, then naturally you are not going to impose all of these ridiculous restrictions upon him. If he is not an adult, then you take a different course. I would say whether or not he is adult -- and there are different ways of defining adulthood, including legal ones -- he certainly has a long way to go developmentally. In this respect he is like all the rest of us, in that he can develop further if the conditions are right.

With regard to opportunities for development, the college freshman is in the position of a man who is retiring as a professor. The retiring professor faces a very different kind of situation than he did before. He has to get out of the ruts into which he has fitted comfortably for so long. In other words, he confronts new challenges, and it's quite remarkable to notice how these people develop further. They begin taking a new lease on life. They see the world differently, behave differently toward other people who behave differently toward them. The first thing you know, your retiring college professor has become virtually a new man. The reason he has been so slow to develop for the past twenty years is that he hasn't been exposed to enough new challenges. His existing repertory has been exploited and he has been rewarded for that, and nothing has happened to shake him into a situation that would really challenge him. If the retiring professor is faced with new challenges he develops, which is like the situation of the college freshman.

We must note -- and you will see the reason why -- that rates of development differ from one individual to another. One of the difficulties of the dean is that he has to deal with freshmen, some of whom are far ahead developmentally by ordinary standards and others who are at quite different stages, and the pressure on him is to make one set of arrangements do for all. That is one way of formulating our problem.

I will now turn to the question of what the residential college can do. If individual development is our aim, then all the resources of the college should be used in the interests of promoting this aim. The ways in which we arrange residences and the kinds of life we encourage there must be considered with a view to what they contribute to our goals and in what ways they hamper their achievement.

I want to look at residence programs in a very general way, making reference to some of their features and asking how they contribute to the goals of education. If there is time I would then like to mention two or three aspects of the person and consider how they are affected by residential arrangements.

In building dormitories, for example, how important is it to assure that students have some privacy? What do we have in mind? What are the virtues of privacy? In terms of the theory I am offering, privacy is basic to an individual's automony and self-respect. Not to have privacy is to be regarded as a child or as an animal. We must arrange things so that however much community we might have, we always make sure that students have ample access to privacy.

Students are saying today that they want more sense of community. This is one of the new slogans of Stanford students. "We want community," they say; and as a matter of fact, they show in many ways that their concern for other people and for their relationships to other people is far more important to them than intellectual achievement or any other kind of achievement *per se*.

But what is meant by community? And how does community fit into our plan for a developmental education? Does it mean that students want some kind of group support for their intellectual objectives, or that they want to be in a situation in which they can know people well? Do they want to lose themselves in a group? Or do they have hopes of finding themselves in a group? When the phrase "intellectual community" is used, what precisely is meant? What are its features and how does it relate to educational goals?

This is the place to speak of some of the different plans for residential colleges. When we say a residential college, I take this to mean that the teaching and curriculum are put into the college where students live. It's not just a matter of assembling some students in a building or in a little group of buildings and trying to make life comfortable for them or trying to develop community among them. A residential college is a place where the intellectual offerings of the college are integrated with the lives of the students. However much people in the psychoanalytic, student-centered, or student personnel services say about the emotional needs of students and the personality development of students, there is no way to get around the fact that in college the curriculum and teaching are the central features and the basic means by which personality develops.

I would say that reaching a young person at this age is mainly a matter of reaching his mind, and we reach his mind through the offerings of books and teaching. When we say an intellectual community of living and learning, we mean a genuine integration of intellectual activity with the activities of ordinary life. By bringing the curriculum into where people live, we have a much better chance of showing students the relevance of academic learning to their lives, just as we have a better chance of generating in them the kind of interest and motivation necessary to sustain them when they undertake difficult intellectual work.

This subject is dear to my heart. I began promoting at Vassar College the idea of what we then called the experimental college in 1955. I persuaded Miss Blanding, President of Vassar at the time, that this was a project that we should take to the foundations. We were going to take Rockefeller Hall, which housed a hundred and fifty girls, and Cushing Hall, with two hundred girls, and make them into two colleges. The latter, called Mickeljohn College, would be based on the Mickeljohn-Wisconsin idea where everybody studies the Greeks for the first year and another period of history the second year -- no departments, no courses, just studying along with the teachers, who would exhibit how to learn rather than just dispensing knowledge they had acquired. The other college was going to be on the Sarah Lawrence individual education plan. Each college would be presided over by a faculty devoted to this particular kind of education, out to show that it was the best in the world. They would win the loyalty of the students; a certain tension would be generated between the two and between these two colleges and the rest of the college, and all sorts of exciting things would happen.

We were told by the foundations that no money was then being spent for women's colleges. The new look was for co-education, and so we began promoting a men's college on the Vassar farm. The upshot of all this is that Vassar may move to Yale!

What is interesting is that the experiment in one type of college as compared with another college in terms of effects has never been done. I would be perfectly content if it is not done now because the idea of the residential college has been put across anyway. This is a good example of how social science operates. While we are still talking about the experiment that we are some day going to do if we can get the money, educators are picking up ideas, and actually putting them into effect. This idea, which was promoted at the University of California beginning in 1958, became the basic plan for the new university campus at Santa Cruz, and it's been carried further at the new campus at San Diego.

You can call this educational experimentation if you like. I call it social change in which people responsible for other people find ideas wherever they can, and if they are convincing ideas, put them into effect. We will learn twenty or thirty years from now whether these ideas were indeed viable.

When we say "intellectual community," I think that it is important to insure that students study the same thing at the same time. I like the Mickeljohn College idea because everybody in the college studies the same thing at the same time, including the faculty. Thus it is the most natural thing in the world for conversation about what happened in the classroom to continue in all sorts of other settings. It helps to break down the awful hiatus between what one does in the dorms or in the classrooms. In order to insure this and promote solidarity in this community, I think it is important that students have the same experiences at the same time. There is nothing that draws people together so much as shared experiences, particularly if they are somewhat trying experiences.

This has been demonstrated at St. Johns College at Annapolis, the Great Books College, where students have a learning experience that is at times almost too challenging. A St. Johns type program in which everybody has had everybody else in seminars requires a strong psychiatric agency in the immediate vicinity! Years after they graduate, St. Johns students greet each other like old soldiers, recalling the old days at St. Johns when so and so gave so and so such a bad time. This is real community and solidarity. And when the whole thing is in the interest of learning and intellectual development, you've got something pretty good. This has not been imitated more because it is a threat to all of academia. To have a college without departments is the last thing the ordinary academic man wants to contemplate.

Nevertheless, that same kind of college is now in its third year of operation at Berkeley under Professor Joseph Tussman. He has run one class through two years of the Mickeljohn program and a new group of freshmen are starting this year with great enthusiasm and verve. It has had its difficulties. Although this is not even a residential college, but a form of fraternity house where all of the work of the college goes on with the students living elsewhere, the students still achieve a sense of solidarity through spending most of their days in this house.

The ideal institution, the ideal cluster college, has not yet, in my view, been established. This is one in which you have this kind of curriculum in a place where the students also live to maximize the opportunities for development that I have been talking about. This kind of community, of course, must be a student-adult community in order to get away from a generational thing.

The idea of a community made up only of students strikes me as faintly ridiculous. Any human community includes people of different ages, and I suppose the reason why students sometime speak as if it is impossible to communicate with people over thirty is because for sixteen years they have been segregated on an age basis and taught they must always be with people their own age. In a technological civilization, we seem to assume that we can process people better if we put those who are the same together, so that students often feel uncomfortable if they have to relate closely with people of a different age.

But this won't do at all. In an ideal college there should be old men and women, some of these retired professors that I spoke of earlier, married students and their children, people of divers academic ranks and status -- all thrown together in a truly human community. That's another ideal. An experiment at Stanford embodies part of it. A fraternity house became vacant, and there was a great deal of discussion about how it might be used for an experiment in coeducational living and in curriculum reorganization. People of different sexes and different classes from freshman to graduate school moved in there and they all studied the processes of development in the relatively less developed countries under the leadership of three or four professors. There were only eighty people in the house -- the girls upstairs, the boys downstairs, and several professors. This was generating such excitement last spring that this fall four of the houses in Wilbur Hall cluster are going to be used for the same kind of purpose. Girls are going to be brought in to live in one house and boys in the other; there will be a common dining room and a focus on a problem area, like international relations, race relations, under-developed countries, or something of that kind. This is really quite promising and would not be difficult to imitate on a massive scale.

One thing we are after in the cluster or residential college idea is to have the benefits of smallness within a large university, and this, of course, is enormously important. If students are to gain the most from teachers, they must see them in situations in which the teachers really reveal themselves as people and not just dispensers of information or graders of papers. They have got to see their teachers and relate to them as men, and this apparently can only occur if the ratio of teachers to students is not too much out of line.

Let me emphasize that in Joseph Tussman's college there are only five professors and a hundred and fifty students, exactly the same ratio as in the freshman class generally. But the fact that this is the way the enterprise is organized means that everybody knows everybody very well and the professors are known by the students because the professors are fully exposed. They argue with each other in front of students and the students get to know them. They see them in all kinds of settings other than just the classrooms. If they are worthy, they will become models for students. More than that, the professors know the students and actually grade their papers. By that I mean they read the paper and sit down with the student and discuss the paper, something which happens almost nowhere else in the university. Yet the professors are in no way overworked. Being responsible for thirty students in a seminar is not a great burden, particularly if you know something about how to do it. Fraternization with them is not the thing, but encounter of a certain kind and at the right time. And the best encounters occur when you've got the student and his paper, and you can show him what's wrong with his work and how to improve. That is the only kind of grading that has any particular educational value.

And, of course, students ought to be in a situation where they can know other students well. One of the saddest things about campus life today is the general deterioration in campus friendships. If you take high pressure places such as Stanford, there are hundreds of boys that go through four years of college without making a friend with whom they maintain touch for more than a month after they leave college. They can't afford to expose themselves that much to other students. They feel other students might use them in some fashion or another if they let them know too much about themselves. This is the basis for the fact that Stanford students are always talking about different housing arrangements. They have the feeling that somehow, somewhere, if they could just shake up the housing situation enough, their sense of intimacy with other people could be improved. We do know from the Lozoff study that freshmen who live for a year in freshmen dormitories emerge more hostile toward their fellow man than they were at the beginning. Being crowded together, thrown into close relationships with people they don't know and often don't want to know, proves for many freshmen an extremely difficult kind of experience to which they often react with resentment and hostility. In this way dormitory life works against the aim of liberating persons and developing their love of humanity.

The whole governance of these residences, the whole structure, ought to be looked at with attention to its significance for the development of the student. I mentioned authoritariansim earlier as the type of personality structure standing in contrast to the ideal. The way we manage these residents and formulate the rules is enormously important in determining whether or not authoritarianism is reinforced in the students or whether it is gradually replaced by autonomy in which the student is increasingly his own authority.

The way we manage the rules and what we do respecting alcohol, drugs, and sex is also enormously important for the development of persons toward autonomy and self-understanding. We have got to be able to say what we are for when we talk about alcohol, drugs, and sex because it is no longer helpful just to be rigidly rejective. We are beyond that and at a place where we have to say what we are for. We are not against pleasure, but are for maximizing it as a matter of fact by showing how this can be done through integrating activities in these areas with the rest of the personality. And this is no sudden or quick achievement. It's something that takes place gradually and is all of a piece with the rest of one's education.

The main need is to try to break down some of these terrible hiatuses that exist in the university. In contrast, one can almost say that the university today has managed to separate practically everything that really belongs together. The universities separate learning from life, science from practice, this course from all other courses; they separate feeling from thinking, men from women, youth from adults -- all in the interests of some purposes, but not individual development.

Our aim is to try somehow to restore the wholeness of this enterprise. The residential college, in my view, would be one of the best ways to do it. This is to assume that the residential college is going to be coeducational; that it's going to involve adults and students in its orientation; that it's going to get rid of the departmental structure which segregates knowledge into the departments; that the curriculum is going to be either problem-oriented or centered in great ideas, so that there's a fair chance for the William James type of knowing.

Comments by Discussants

DANA L. FARNSWORTH: William James once said that the first lecture on psychology he ever heard was the first one he ever gave. He was trained as a physician, and physicians are in general excellent examples of persons who have developed blinders during their educational experience which keep them from appreciating the rest of the world. But physicians aren't the only ones who have blinders. Theologians, scientists, students of the social sciences, law students -- all have them. But each one has a different set of blinders. I think this tendency to get into a gun-barrel type of vision is what Professor Sanford was talking about.

I am trying to write a paper now on what counseling should be like in the next fifty years. I am starting with the assumption that as the acquisition of information becomes simpler, knowledge *per se* seems to be increasing at about a hundred per cent every ten years. As such acquisition becomes a simpler process, a matter of routine in most colleges, there is increasing concern about how facts are related to one another. What we must be working for in the residential college is the ability to relate.

We have a crisis in meaning. We are always having crises, that's the mark of the intellectual, and we worry about several dozen each year. But this current crisis in meaning is really one of the most complex we have ever faced.

Take, for example, your concept of the change in stimulus. You contend that change in stimuli is necessary. I would call such change harmful when it becomes so rapid that it takes away all feelings of meaning, belonging, or relatedness. Too many stimuli prevent satisfaction. Of course, we are both right. Dr. Sanford is right because those of us who don't have stimuli, who don't change, get in shallow ruts. On the other hand, those who have too many stimuli and too much change get preoccupied with moving faster and faster in an unknown direction, as George Santayana said some sixty or seventy years ago.

So part of the job that we are concerned with here is how to remove these blinders and how to deal with the great mass of material that we are all supposed to master. I am so far behind in medicine that I'll never catch up. Anybody in any of the professions, unless he is digging away at that one little vein, gets quite far behind. Yet we must somehow teach our students how to approach their problems in their entirety, problems whose nature we cannot yet grasp. And it takes a pretty neat bit of know-how to get people ready for change so that they will not change so rapidly as to feel unrelated to things that have gone before and things that will come after, and yet will be comfortable in the process and not become over stimulated.

At one of our staff administrative luncheons, where once a week at Harvard our deans, psychiatrists, psychologists, counselors, and members of the united ministry meet for lunch, we were discussing the ruling in which the

Cornell administration said, in a sense, to the students, "You're on your own." They are getting rid of the in loco parentis idea (or being "crazy like a parent," as somebody said). They are going to let the students fend with the local constabulary for themselves. This means that the police can come in and stake out the place and find out who's doing what, with whom, and how often.

Now, if this is the way the University is going, then we had all better become large urban universities with lecturers who are textbooks wired for sound, with plenty of encyclopedias around, and just do what comes naturally. But this is not what we are trying to do. Rather, we are trying to develop a sense of relatedness, movement, and belonging in students, a sense of being able to view man and his world, without being so closely attached to any particular point of view that they can't get out and gain experience on their own that will give them new insights.

As Professor Sanford has said, genuine education is designed to bring out the best in a person, to make him unique, to make him the best of whatever he can be -- in short, to make him different from all others. In contrast, training is designed to make the individual like other persons, to fit into a cog, to fit into a machine. Hence training is the natural enemy of education and should be postponed for as long as we can afford to do so.

D. GORDON ROHMAN: I was tempted to begin by saying that the first lecture I ever heard on college making was the one I made when I was appointed Dean at the Justin Morrill College at Michigan State a week before it was created by the trustees. That isn't quite true, for I think I did read something of Nevitt Sanford before then. I can say now from the perspective of two years that confidence is what you feel before you understand the problem. And I can also sympathize with what Dr. Farnsworth was saying about the phenomenon of over stimulation. Perhaps I borrowed this from the sociologists but I've heard this called "data dazzle."

I'd like to give a testimony about something I suspect won't otherwise get formally handled in any of our remarks and that is the benefit of residential colleges for the faculty who are involved in them. We've talked about how good they are for students. I can speak with feeling and passion about what I think are the benefits to me. I was absolutely frightened by the awe-full sense that in the initiation of a college every act one commits is a formative one, and also with the realization that one cannot postpone action. When we are caught in a dilemma, as in most decisions, educational or otherwise, we are always acting in advance of sufficient evidence to justify the action. That's an aweful, and awe-inspiring realization. It might even be paralyzing, but that isn't what I want to talk about at this point.

I speak out of the experience of practical engagement with the problems motivated by the concerns and idealisms which Nevitt Sanford described. Challenge is indeed the style of education and what we are trying to develop is not people with more information but people with learning resourcefulness. The setting of the residential college is perhaps one of the most ideally suited for that.

But the question arises, when does challenge become its pejorative opposite, manipulation? Are we sure enough of our knowledge of what is good and what works that we can with confidence employ certain procedures in the expectation that they are indeed going to develop students in a healthy, humane, and mature way? That is a very practical problem for us. I have nightmares of the sort of 1984, we-know-what-is-good-for-you, kind of schooling that none of us in principle would promote, but many in practice perpetrate. For example, does the student's right to privacy conflict with our obligation to keep him moving in his development towards maturity and responsibility? And the related question is, how skilled is a college faculty? How skilled are we? Am I? How skilled is even the psychologist in putting on a developmental education? Or to put it another way, where are sufficient adult models to be found that we can with confidence enact a program dedicated to developmental education?

I say this with feeling because we are ourselves caught in this dilemma. We are committed to developmental education in Justin Morrill College. We have tried in a variety of ways, sometimes successfully and sometimes less successfully, to institutionalize styles of education that we think are developmental. But I think we need to know more about where challenge becomes manipulation. Frankly, I look to men such as Nevitt Sanford to give us guidance in a situation where if not "data dazzle," at least we have a sort of intellectual snow blindness at times.

Group Discussion

NEVITT SANFORD (in response to a question about the relation between communality and differentiation in higher education): We've got to have the resourcefulness to have both freedom and union, diversity and communality, individuality and the social structure, etc. and we are talking about different ways of doing this. I've spoken on both sides of this. I've spoken in favor of a core curriculum for freshmen. On the other hand I can get terribly keen about individual education for freshmen. I'm a great advocate of anarchic education. When they put in the new freshman program last year in which each freshman was going to choose his own program with the help of a preceptor, I was a little dubious about it. Nonetheless, they had a very exciting time with that.

A way to answer this is to observe that one way is better for some students and another is better for other students. So they should have both kinds of experiences, one in one year and the other in the next year. As a matter of fact, I like that idea. I don't think we'd lose a thing by having one of these hard core curricula for freshmen. Just when the students get well adapted to this, we challenge them with a totally different kind of setup to which they are invited to adapt themselves.

Now, most people who think about residential colleges do not expect that everything that the student studies in his first year will be studied in the residential college. One can take languages or math outside, or maybe something else outside. In other words, they can attach themselves to some of the vast range of things that the university has to offer. That's all right as a way of getting the two in parallel at the same time, but I would really like to see an effort made to go all out on the core curriculum and community solidarity for a while. Let everybody have that kind of experience fully and then have a different sort. And, of course, one thing I think should be said is that there's plenty of time. We don't have to do everything at once and to partake fully of the riches of the university takes time. We've got the time if we organize it properly in an affluent society such as this. In fact, the students are taking plenty of time anyway in present circumstances.

The thing is to give students enough challenge and variety to prevent their settling down into some sort of comfortable style of life that tends to become too persistent. The key question is how to structure this challenge in such a way that it really favors development and doesn't lead to some kind of retreat or withdrawal into some more primitive way of adapting. By and large, the problem with college students is to keep them awake through sufficient challenges. They can master so quickly most of the stuff with which we present them that the first thing you know they have got all of that under their belts and are looking outside the campus for challenges. To keep moving with them is the thing.

NEVITT SANFORD (in response to a question about the relevance of his view of education to undergraduate professional training, e.g. nursing or teaching): Apparently I'm on record as favoring postponing the professional training as long as possible. But if it's going to be an undergraduate degree in a professional specialty, we could still use the freshman and sophomore years for a special kind of educational experience. If we were to take some students who were going into nursing, for example, and give them two years in Tussman's college, the would probably be just as well prepared for two years of upper division work in their specialty as would students who have had a string of elementary courses presumably prerequisite to those specialties.

What we do in so many colleges is to teach the same thing three or four times at different stages. We teach high school physics, freshman physics, junior physics, graduate school physics, and so on. The physicist will tell you that this is all absolutely necessary, that unless he has all of this physics, all of the time, he is absolutely lost to physics. I don't really believe that. I think physicists can make a better case for it than anybody else, but I don't even believe that in the case of physics. It's possible for these bright young men to be even better physicists if they are men first and they get their physics later on.

D. GORDON ROHMAN: Isn't it also possible that the most efficient preprofessional and professional education might be one that develops a kind of learning resourcefulness, that takes some time from an information-oriented mastery of material but spends more time in developing a style of learning that might actually contribute to a profession? We think of these as dichotomous, either he is developing his life style or his professional style. But each might very well contribute meaningfully to the other in ways that have perhaps not yet been named.

NEVITT SANFORD: Absolutely. Look at William James, who studied art for two years quite seriously before he decided he would try science. He tried biological science very seriously for a couple of years and that convinced him that he was really interested in psychology -- that and a few other things.

Now, what do we do? We insist that the student decide what he is going to do and be at the time he enters college when he is totally unprepared to make any such decision, and then penalize him if he trys to change. It's very interesting to cite how many really important figures have been several different things at different times. Sigmund Freud would be a nice case in point, for he had several careers before he became a psychoanalyst. I wouldn't mind early specialization if the people who are responsible for this specialty would let a person change when he decided that this wasn't exactly his dish of tea. But the liberal arts colleges exact high penalties upon students who want to change their major in senior year or who major in one thing and then want to do something else in graduate schools. This is really sad. Graduate schools actually take grades in the specialty of that school as a basis for judging preparation for graduate school. There was never a more ridiculous idea than that, demonstrating the bankruptcy of graduate schools when it comes to knowing how to select people. In psychology, I'd be much more interested in a student who majored in English, philosophy, history, or whatever, because we can teach him psychology once he gets to graduate school if he knows how to learn.

DANA L. FARNSWORTH: I'd like to comment on how people teach, based as much on what happens in medical school as elsewhere. There's too much of a tendency toward teaching each person as if he is going to be a specialist in his field. There's too much intellectual seduction going on. If we would get more of our teachers to teach students rather than solely the subject, we could get the diversity that you're talking about. For example, I think a physician should be roughly eighty per cent a specialist. I want my surgeon to know how to take out my gall bladder if it has to be taken out. But on the other hand, I don't want my internist or psychiatrist to know only the technical aspects of his field. We ought to teach him to be roughly twenty per cent a generalist in other fields and eighty per cent a specialist, and how to relate a lot of seemingly diverse things together in such a way as to make sense out of them.

If the individual doesn't get this ability his first year or two in college, he'll never get it. He will continue to go more and more into a narrow field. If he gets it early, then he can become a specialist and in general tend to remain that. It's like religious training. The person who does not get religious training as a youngster cannot really make a free choice when he gets to be 18 or so because he has nothing on which to base his judgment. So when the student who has not had this developmental sort of training gets into his specialization period in chemistry or physics or political science, he is doomed to keep on going in a narrow, but potentially very productive and rich vein. It could be richer if he had this developmental phase in mind.

D. GORDON ROHMAN (in response to a question about how realistic the residential college is in underestimating the admittedly arbitrary categories of the disciplines): You may be interested in our particular attempt to teach in the college a curriculum whose ends are general or liberal education, but which uses professors representing the disciplines who have been challenged to present their disciplines as ways of organizing knowledge. I suspect this is seldom done in the departments. They are simply organized as ways of pursuing a major, so there need not be any necessary dichotomy between studying a subject and studying a discipline as a means of responsibly conceptualizing or ordering that subject.

There are a variety of ways of approaching this. Our pattern, for example, is not a single subject matter studied from various patterns of perception, as in Mr. Tussman's college. Quite often, in such an approach, the students tend to use an assumed set of categories for analysis that are perhaps not conscious. In our particular case, we have gotten teachers from the university community whose strength we assumed was a disciplinary identification (to try to get the best of that world) to participate in our world, the residential college, by seeing their disciplines in an epistomological sense, as a way of conceptualizing the world. How different is the treatment of a topic by a psychologist from the way that an historian or someone else would "treat" the same topic? That's our idea, but in practice you don't convince people to do something by writing it down on a piece of paper and saying, "This is your ideal." I don't think in practice we have necessarily produced courses that view disciplines as ways of organizing knowledge. What we have produced are courses where persons have, in spite of themselves, presented models of learning, and so we got something for our bargain even though perhaps we didn't get all of it. The most direct answer in our particular experience is that we have tried deliberately to make use of the disciplines in a total context of what Nevitt Sanford has called the "developmental purposes of education."

NEVITT SANFORD: I should comment on that, too, because I have been sowing a certain amount of confusion by introducing my interest in curricula renovation in connection with the residential college. We can have a residential college in which the curriculum is a very conventional five course curriculum. As a matter of fact, when we promoted the college idea at Berkeley, we were calling it an experimental college and we decided that in that setting it would be better not to get mixed up in curriculum reform but to insure the faculty that we were going to give them a very hard solid curriculum. We took the Chicago curriculum -- social science, humanities -- and found people who wanted to teach those things. We were assuming that to present this curriculum in a residential setting would be more effective than presenting that same curriculum elsewhere. We would have students who would take advantage of the Hawthrone effect, students out to show that they were going to learn better and faster than anybody else. We hoped in fact that they would, and we assumed that when motivated in this fashion they would learn these hard courses very rapidly and actually be ahead of the game when it came to the other division. Now, I would say that we can have colleges with a diversity of curriculum including the prevalent ones. But then I have this other concern, which is curricular change of a very radical sort. I'm advancing it at the same time, for I want to take advantage of this interest in the residential college to get people to make some curriculum reforms, to do some innovation in this area at the same time.

NEVITT SANFORD (in response to a question about whether the residential college is being conceived as a two year or four year program): Both kinds of markets exist. At Santa Cruz the students are expected to stay in their cluster college for four years. Each college there has about six hundred students and they live in a cluster of houses, each of which houses around fifty students, all nicely designed with privacy and community in mind. This is called a cluster college or residential college program. This means there is an effort to establish within a large university some colleges much like the liberal arts colleges that we've had, to make available the benefits that the liberal arts colleges have always said they had to offer, i.e. relatively small classes, lots of student-teacher interaction, students who know all the other students. The aim is to get these values within the university where diversity can also be had, because there is nothing to prevent students from going to other colleges or to the common library and laboratories.

To do something for two years with freshmen and sophomores might be easier to put across than a four year program. The way to start reorganizing the search for knowledge is by recognizing that the present departmental structure was not designed by God or for eternity. It's just a system that grew by all kinds of accidents and has now become self-perpetuating because every man is interested in perpetuating his department. To overcome this, it would be much easier to say, "Well, you're interested in teaching your specialty. Wouldn't it be better if you just taught this to juniors and seniors and graduate students than to freshmen and sophomores?" Let the dean of Undergraduate Education handle the first two years in whatever way he can find the faculty and then do it without the present way of organizing knowledge.

The need for different ways of organizing knowledge is becoming acute, both in respect to the search for knowledge and in respect to teaching. In a general way, freshmen and sophomores are in a developmental stage where the big integrating ideas are somehow more suitable and I would like to see them get these first and become more analytical and specialized later. A freshman is a natural generalist. He does not understand that knowledge is departmentalized. If he gets to know a professor, he will ask the professor all the questions that he has on his mind, as if he believed that because this chap is a professor, he can answer these questions, or at least have something to tell us about them. It's all of two weeks before he discovers that you're not supposed to ask someone in one field about what you've learned in another.

DANA L. FRANSWORTH: When we find the perfect curriculum it will no longer be suitable. That's one of the ironies of education. Lyman Wilbur long ago pointed out that it is easier to move a graveyard than to change a college curriculum. When you think of all that has to be moved, you can see how apt that statement is.

NEVITT SANFORD (in response to a query about student responses to education viewed as the development of personality): If you really plan something and are serious about it, aren't you then close to manipulation? I would like students to get the idea that they are developing individuals, and it's no disgrace to be in that position because we all are. There is nobody who can't develop further, including Socrates if he were still alive. And there is no reason why they can't conceive of themselves in this fashion and actually help in the search for the kinds of experiences that will in fact be developmental. I know a young man who got on to this idea when he was still a graduate student. I guess he became a kind of an ally of mine when he was still a graduate student. He became a wonderfully articulate exponent of all this. He was an English Ph.D. at Berkeley, a Chaucer man. He could put into words psychological ideas and they really sounded good. Then he went off to teach at one of the great liberal arts colleges, and I was amazed the other day when he visited Berkeley to discover that he was not even teaching any-more. He is in a different field; he has become a foundation man. Naturally, I asked him, "Well, why this change?" And he said because he had found out he could teach. He had made himself a good teacher and was now ready for a different challenge. That's rather unusual, but very interesting. You see, this young man was looking at his life in developmental terms and if you take this seriously it means that once you have mastered one challenge, you try something else. This doesn't mean that he will not return to teaching, but he had visions of himself staying on for thirty years at this great college being regarded as a good teacher, but in fact doing what he now knew perfectly well how to do. When he said he knew how to teach, he really did know how to teach; it became clear as he went on to explain something about his teaching methods.

It would be a fine thing if students could conceive of their own lives in this way, if they could somehow become sufficiently future oriented to plan their lives and ways like people used to. This used to be quite the fashion, particularly in Europe, for people to plan their lives according to aesthetic values. In those days you could plan because the world didn't change quite so fast. When we speak of challenges, this does not mean walking up to students and saying, "This is your challenge for today. I want you to rise to the occasion." In fact, these words won't enter into our discourse at all. We'll find other words, but if you are going to undertake anything with students, you naturally let them in on what you are going to do.

Tussman's program is a carefully planned program and he doesn't want to modify it much once it's begun. He explains fully to the students that they have all kinds of alternatives as to what they are going to enter, but that once they start, they should finish. They don't have to start this; they can take all kinds of other curricular offerings, so that this is done with the fullest possible participation by the student in the planning of his education.

I think it is simply ordinary human relations that you don't approach students with some sort of hidden agenda. I would restrict the term "manipulation" to deceptive operations in which the student is not let in on our plan for him. This is bad even in dealing with little children. To treat them as if they were incapable of understanding what is happening to them or could participate in no way in the decision affecting them is bad. It's a direct assault upon the individual ego. If you are going to plan something for students, by all means plan it with students and always explain sufficiently what you are going to do and why, so that you have their support from the beginning. The other day, I gave a lecture on authoritaranism in relation to education to a group of freshmen at San Diego. I gave my Psychology 138 on authoritaranism (I wouldn't dare give anything less to entering freshmen today) in which I talked about individual development and planning things that would promote it. In the course of the discussion one of the students said, "Isn't this a nice case of authoritaranism? You plan what you want people to become and then with all kinds of psychological subtlety you arrange things so that they will become the way you want them to become." One way out of this is to say that I am interested in freedom; in maximizing the freedom of choice that a student has. He doesn't have this by virtue of having been born. He gets this by virtue of a kind of upbringing, and anybody who brings up children has to take the responsibility for a program. You don't just bring up children the way your mother brought you up. Today you have to make informed judgments about what you ought to do. Educators are not free from this responsibility and shouldn't be. To have convictions and be willing to think seriously about how to achieve aims is hardly authoritaranism. It is simply responsible citizenship.

D. GORDON ROHMAN: We inherit an attitude after 12 years of schooling, that education is something you do to a student. The great possibility of the residential college idea is that it will provide an arena in which we can prove the legitimacy of the notion that education is something you do with someone and not to him. I can imagine no more fruitful setting than a residential college in which to prove this.

We have to recognize that we do inherit attitudes that are probably anthithetical to developmental education. What then is the way in which we can authenticate what we mean when we say that we need developmental education?

I fear any kind of institutionalization of a curriculum or a pattern because too often it presents students with an integrated curriculum which he must simply bear. I look towards an ideal college that is constantly integrating or constantly re-creating or renewing itself every year with every new student body. It dramatizes in action as well as in words that it is working with them in education, not simply doing something to them which is subject to the charge -- even though unintended -- of being manipulative.

PARKER HUDSON: Students who seem to other students, faculty, and administrators to be really developing people, are the kind of students who find a place for themselves outside of the classroom, who find some area in which they can become involved and develop this sort of total personality we've been talking about. I wonder how many students really think of the classroom experience as the kind of area in which they really want to get involved? How many of us think of the classroom just as something we have to go to five or six times a week and then forget about, going elsewhere to get our challenges and to have our experiences? I think that's the way most students look at it. We all know that freshmen have a lot of problems in all areas -- social, academic, all kinds of problems. But isn't a big part of the freshman wasteland the fact that they have nothing else than information gathering to do, nothing else for them to get involved in? Part of growing up and becoming upperclassmen is to find enough outside interests to become involved in that you do become a person. The idea of the residential college system is to bring these outside influences on the person from the beginning and to make the learning experience this kind of challenging experience so that students don't have to get out of the classroom or get away from their professors to find something exciting. I wonder how many of us ever look at our professors and want to use them as models for anything, frankly, except perhaps how to assimilate information. We may learn a few jokes from some of them, but for a lot of people class time is sleep time. The residential college idea is supposed to introduce this kind of challenge at the outset so that freshmen and sophomores can start to be challenged in other ways.

For a lot of students the only challenge is to rise to the mediocrity, to see how they can get through the most course material with the least amount of work. Frankly, I'm challenged by that. If I can get through enough work with good grades so that I can then go to other areas and not be tied down by having to read, that's great, because then I can still keep a good grade which society likes and I can get ahead later on. I can make my professors happy and yet still go other places, have enough time to find other challenges or other ways to experience life. What we are attempting to do is to integrate all of these things together so that we don't run away from what education is supposed to be in order to find education.

LOU BROWN: Some of the comments here have stirred my thoughts, especially in relation to my role as a house advisor for the past two years. The first week of school this year I had the unique opportunity to orient a group of ten freshmen and supposedly tell them all the clues about how to go through Carolina, all the information they need to know so they wouldn't be left out in the cold. During this week they filled out a questionnaire from the Office of Admissions which asked a lot of questions. One set was especially interesting in light of what's been said tonight. It was a series of questions generally headed by a question which asked, "Why are you in college? What do you expect to get out of college?" And following this was a list of alternatives which they were supposed to rate from "essential" to "very important" to "somewhat important" to "not important." In looking over this group of ten responses to these questions, I found that most of them were here basically to make more money four years from now. Some of them had a little realization that they were supposed to become experts in some field but these were the only alternatives that were considered "essential": to become an expert and to make some money.

This disturbed me greatly and tonight has made me realize that perhaps part of the reason that a lot of them don't wise up while they are here for four years is that we impose upon them two years of a general college in which they are required to take certain basic courses. I found from my own experience that a lot of times you are confronted by a nice graduate student who besides trying to teach you Modern Civilization, summing up about a hundred years a day in class, is trying also to get his own Ph.D. So you end up trying to survive the semester and to consume a large syllabus prepared twenty years ago.

The point is that the student comes here for money. He may be stimulated his first semester or first year and really become interested in something. But the second year he still finds himself tied down to a list of courses that he has to survive before he can make it to his junior year and really get into a field in which he is interested. By the end of that second year he has learned to survive subjects he is interested in, or he has lost all his interest in learning or in an education and is now just looking for a degree and more money. Maybe we should look for a way to parallel the conformity principle and the individual principle through college rather than making a layer cake proposition. Maybe we should stretch the required courses through four years in order to allow a person a little experimentation even in his freshman year, when he may not be ready for experimentation. Maybe that can be a learning process also. But I definitely think that we do need to teach students to look for a little more education and not tie them down so much, even though conformity and acquaintance with subjects they aren't really interested in is important.

SHARON ROSE: I think students do want to be challenged. Many students want to be and are able to challenge themselves. This has been shown through our own student innovations and the experimental pilot programs. We're bored with our classroom experience so we are challenging ourselves in such programs as the Experimental College. But it took me four years to figure out that I can challenge myself. We really have to concern ourselves with the students who don't want to be challenged, who couldn't care less, students who are going to go through four years getting by with just the minimum. These are the students I think we have to approach and appeal to in this new concept of challenging and thinking.

QUALITY OF LIFE WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY

Dana L. Farnsworth

The fundamental goal of an educational institution should be to foster intellectual growth and activity and provide an atmosphere of freedom in which intellectual power can be responsibly exercised. The problem about which we are now so concerned is that we've got plenty of smart people, but they're not sure where they are going and we are not sure we are providing the best assistance to them. Ideally, the student is internally motivated to participate in the educational process, so that it continues, after the formal learning program ends, as a source of satisfaction. College and graduate work should be relevant to the student's previous experience and also to his subsequent life situation, but it should also permit him to go far afield, when he desires to do so, in areas of knowledge or research that have no immediate relevance to such practical matters as making a living. A well-educated person should be practical enough to make his way through a materialistic and hedonistic society such as ours often appears to be, and yet still be able to deal with highly theoretical concepts.

Recent developments in our institutions of higher learning (and the rest of society as well) indicate that there is an appalling lack of communication between the older, more conservative elements and many young people. When I say "more conservative elements," I am not talking about people who want what never was, but rather the people who are conservative in the liberal sense; they want to conserve through change, through adapting what is best in our society. This is how I would describe myself, and how I suspect you would describe yourselves. But not only have we failed to transmit our values to the younger generation, we have inadvertently managed to convey the idea that because some of our values are no longer useful (if they ever were), the remainer are also without merit. We have perhaps put too much emphasis on passing on traditions and not enough on reconstructing values to replace those which are outmoded. We have underestimated the idealism as well as the strength of our young people. It has often been said that we are exerting too much pressure on our students, but I believe that many are not being given responsibilities which sufficiently challenge their capabilities. Above all, we have ignored student needs for intimate exchange of ideas and experiences -- an exchange which is vital to their learning how to control, as well as adapt to, rapidly changing technological, social, and cultural conditions of our time.

Unfortunately, we have succeeded in alienating many of our colleagues on the faculty, particularly those who have only recently finished their own formal training or who are still in that intermediate stage of being half-student, half-faculty member. They tend to contaminate people both above and below them, and we have not developed a system in which they could grow out of their immature state. The young faculty member, who is often still in graduate school, is in a peculiarly advantageous position to help bridge the

---

Dr. Farnsworth's visit was co-sponsored by the University of North Carolina School of Public Health.

gap between generations; but when he feels aggrieved, misunderstood, or exploited, he understandably allies himself with any other elements within the institution that are unhappy and desirous of change. When communication between these persons and their more influential (and usually older) colleagues of the faculty and administration becomes attenuated, power tactics may be seen as the only way of resolving the situation.

When decisions are made largely on the basis of who has the most power, more and more people within the institution will be dissatisfied. But when decisions are made after full and frank discussion of the various issues involved, and with all opinions being taken into consideration, effective teaching about the ways in which a democracy should operate is possible -- in fact, an actual demonstration takes place. The current emphasis on "student power" illustrates what can occur when groups trained to criticize and dissent become involved with problems of manipulation instead of devoting their efforts to correcting the more basic defects of the educational process in our colleges.

Those students who have the advantage of close association with a wide variety of persons and ideas have more capacity for growth and constructive adaptation than those whose intellectual and social horizons have been limited. A wide variety is not enough, however. If it were, the most capable college graduates would be those from the large urban universities in which diversity is practically without limit. Unity and diversity are equally necessary.

In every responsible institution, the primary requisite is the individual integrity of all its members. It cannot be expected that all students and all faculty members will always exhibit it, but there should be an implicit (and when necessary, explicit) assumption that the college community will tolerate no extended or permanent violations of personal integrity. This is a point on which I think we are weakening. When a student gets into trouble, we tend to blame some discrepancy in the university or its regulations, or to blame the dean, or to blame the over-all social milieu, or to hide behind currently fashionable theories, to avoid coming to grips with the real problem, facing it, and making it into a teaching-learning situation.

Just as scientific credibility and advances depend upon confidence in the honesty of scientific investigators, so the intellectual fabric of a university community depends on a belief in the personal integrity of all who participate in it. Cheating, plagiarizing, slanting results to fit a preconceived pattern, and all other forms of dishonesty should be met with strong disapproval. At the same time, the offending individual should be made to understand that although his behavior is reprehensible, he can regain respect if and when he refrains from such practices. On the administrative side, we must avoid the idea that we want to get rid of students who don't suit us. We do not want to say that they have to do things to suit us; rather that we and they both have to act in such a way that we will achieve the highest degree of satisfaction in the long run.

The lines between integrity and duplicity, honesty and dishonesty are not always clear, and may vary with varying circumstances. Rigid rules cannot be laid down, but individuals can be made sensitive to the principles involved. President Pusey once defined an intellectual as a person who puts a high premium on thinking but an even higher one on thoughtfulness. Concern for integrity cannot be acquired from books or precepts. It must result from interaction with hundreds of individuals, a process during which the significance of questionable forms of behavior is carefully scrutinized. A student is not likely to acquire integrity unless the majority of respected persons within his environment believe in it and practice it.

In a talk in 1959 to Harvard College seniors, President Pusey discussed the preoccupation of early American colleges with the development of moral character. Countless rules, punishments, and fines often had effects on students which were different from those intended. The college president usually gave a course in moral philosophy -- a combination of theology, philosophy and social science -- designed "to provide the explanations and precepts which would enable an educated man to live properly and responsibly in this world and the next." President Pusey answered his own question, "Where in our college has this course gone?" by saying, "Clearly the president doesn't teach it . . . nor does anyone else, by himself. But together perhaps -- students, teachers, all of us, with those who have been here before us -- together perhaps we do. From the beginning this course set for itself aims which cannot be taught. But they can be learned, and it is my belief that, as in an earlier day, so they continue to be learned here now."[1]

In an essay on General Education published in 1936, Robert Maynard Hutchins proposed that for students in the upper two years of high school and the first two years of college the curriculum should consist largely of the permanent studies, "those books which have through the centuries attained to the dimensions of classics." He excluded from this curriculum "body-building," "character-building," the "social graces," and the "tricks of trade."[2] Hutchins' proposal was what my late friend Norbert Weiner called "the brain on stilts" concept of education. Although no one would argue that the "great books" are not important, it is becoming increasingly clear that ancient wisdom needs supplementation. There is currently an alarming disproportion between our ability to analyze the nature of problems and our capacity to solve them, especially in the social sphere.

I would like to address myself to the nature of such supplementation. In a paper called "The Search for Identity" I formulated some goals of education which are impossible to teach, but not to learn.[3] The summary of these goals is:

(1) Respect for all persons, regardless of their race, color, ethnic background, religion, or behavior at the moment. I put that latter in to include our attitude toward those who have offended society by breaking its laws, mainly the prisoners in our various institutions, as well as those who are the victims of prejudice, the significance of which they are largely unaware.

(2) Sufficient knowledge of other people to be able to judge in a general way what their needs are, the ideals they honor, the customs they practice, and the frustrations they endure.

(3) Knowledge of the qualities required for a person to be at home with diverse groups of people and also to be capable of enjoying being alone.

(4) A sensitive and perceptive awareness of one's own nature, both those qualities under the control of the will and those which are not.

(5) Sufficient modesty and humility not to feel impelled to impose one's own ideas on others.

(6) The achievement of a proper balance between self-regard and a concern for the welfare of others.

(7) The ability to appreciate the ways in which one's own self is perceived by others, thereby enabling the individual to modify his own actions continually in order to increase his competence and capacity to relate to others. Many people just don't have any "social thermometer" to guage what's going on around them; they have very unclear ideas of how they affect others, and an incomplete notion as to how others affect them.

(8) The quality of being able to disagree with others without becoming angry, and a conviction that differences of opinion should be settled by the power of rational authority rather than by force, whether verbal or physical. At the same time the value, even the necessity, of righteous (or judicious) indignation should be realized. Many of our students in college (and high schools too) are given the role model of the individual who, when he becomes upset about something, denounces first and thinks later. This way of handling problems does not by its nature foster growth of and in a democratic society.

(9) The habit of inquiry and doubt, practiced in such a way as to avoid becoming either a fanatic who sees simple solutions to complex issues, or a cynic who sees no merit in any constructive activity.

(10) Capacities to conceive of problems that have not yet become apparent and to plan the development of appropriate solutions.

I realize that such goals may be consider old-fashioned, ridiculous, naive, or oversimplified. But, even if some of the goals which we held in the past now need revision, this is no reason why we should reject all of them as being both unneeded and unrevisable. I firmly believe that what is wrong with much of higher learning is reflected in these definitions of fundamentals. Too much reliance has been placed on intellectual power at the expense of emotional balance, good judgment, and self-control. Redressing the balance is not anti-intellectual; it should further the life of the intellect in the highest sense.

If the purpose of a residential college system is to produce the most favorable experience possible during the years of residence in it, we should keep in mind what changes we desire. But it may be helpful to look at what one presently existing system does to its participants. A major object of the Harvard Student Study, now in the ninth year of its existence, is to develop ways to measure change as well as to see what changes occurred in students as they progressed through college. Briefly, we have been studying the progress through college of five hundred students, random samples of each of two Harvard classes, 1964 and 1965. We have now completed all the data accumulation and are in the last year of trying to deal with the bushels of paper that have come out of the computers, analyzing and re-analyzing. Out of this, we hope to learn more about students than most of you will want to know.

The preliminary findings indicate that students do not change in their basic personality characteristics during their college years, but their opinions, attitudes, and certain value orientations do shift. This would suggest that if you are really going to work on developing more studious persons, better motivation, etc., you should start long before students get to college. Their major motivational structures, systems of defenses and coping mechanisms, the kind and intensity of interests, cognitive style and general orientation toward people and things were little changed. This evidence supports the hypothesis that there is a constancy and stability to personality that is set relatively early in life and shows little or no change later.

For most students, the college experience involved a great deal of attention to emotional as well as to intellectual growth. Academic interests were already awakened; removing the barriers between scholarship and other aspects of life was the important accomplishment.[4] There were important changes in the direction of greater openness, flexibility, and movement toward people. Those who defined themselves as liberal were those who showed the most change.[5]

A study of students in the sample who sought psychiatric help during their college career reveals that high intelligence did not increase or decrease the incidence of need. There were three factors, however, where there was a significant correlation with psychiatric consultation. Churchgoers were least likely to ask for help, followed by those who had many friends, and those who rated their past health as excellent. We analyzed about twenty other variables, but there seemed to be no relationship between them and the students' needs for psychiatric help.[6] I think we did prove pretty conclusively that psychiatric help doesn't hurt people in their capacity to graduate with honors, to drop out, to come back to school, etc., and that intelligence is not an emotional handicap!

A portion of the study concerning dating habits indicated that there was one group of the brightest, most academically oriented students who did not date to any extent, even as seniors. These men were pursuing their future careers to the exclusion of any kind of extracurricular activities. They were plagued, much more than the other students, by self-doubt and anxiety. The investigator commented, "It is perhaps not one's dating orientation that is injurious to the personality, but one's not dating at all."[7] So those of you who think social life is important get support from our Student Study. We think young men and women civilize each other about as effectively as any other environmental factor available.

One positive result of four years of living in a residential college has been expressed by one of my colleagues who is just finishing a book on the interpretation of the Rorschach testing done on this group of students:

> After four years in college our men were less likely to generalize and more likely to nail down the big pieces of a problem; less likely, however, to pick out idiosyncratically chosen minutiae for their attention. They were less limited to nothing but the facts, more given to richly complex precepts. They had expanded their emotional lives but at the same time had brought their more lively experiencing under better self-control. They were subtler perceivers of events and more tactful reactors to people. Their originality was more socially useful, more public and repeatable, as it were. Above all, many of them had moved from impulsive emotional reacting at the world about them to good emotional adjustment to enter reality.
>
> Harvard had socialized them. It had materially raised their social I.Q. But at some price. They were more socially intelligent partly because they had learned to take second thoughts . . . and third thoughts and fourth thoughts . . . There was often an obsessive style to their newly-gained awareness of the world's complexity.
>
> Still, the faculty may not object to increased complexity of thought that is harnessed to increased awareness of the folly of generalizing without data. Significantly, many of these men had developed great awareness as both a cognitive and emotional style.[8]

Learning is possible under the most adverse circumstances, but adversity is more apt to induce motivation to learn than to facilitate learning itself. Motivation for learning can be encouraged by practical experience in jobs, social enterprises such as the Peace Corps, Vista Volunteers, volunteer work in prisons, hospitals, settlement houses, or in conducting recreational programs for young people, and even by fulfilling required military service. What is essential is the best possible opportunity to reflect on the meaning of such experience in the light of others' experiences as expressed in their writings and lectures, and, even more importantly, by students trying out their ideas on one another.

In planning conditions for encouraging students to learn from one another, the architectural features of a residential college can make an enormous contribution. Before making specific suggestions, however, several other principles must be considered in the planning of a college. A residential unit should not be too small, or else the variety of students' backgrounds and experiences will be insufficient to keep everyone stimulated and to avoid boredom. If it is too large it creates anew the impersonality which its construction was intended to counteract. In my opinion, an upper limit of four hundred students should be established, with three hundred and fifty being the desirable lower limit. I have come to this conclusion for the following reasons: (1) One can easily learn enough about four hundred people in an academic year to retain a clear visual image of all of them. On one occasion I tried to figure out how many students I could keep in mind in any one year, and I could get up to beyond six hundred. (2) The variety to be encountered in a group of that size must inevitably be extensive, yet one can be expected to have only a few close friends. The size of the group allows shifts in relationships to be made without upsetting the entire group. (3) The group is large enough for social events confined to the unit. (4) The group is small enough for the Master and his wife, Senior Resident, etc., to become acquainted with every individual during the year. (5) Assuming the students live in the same unit during all four years of college, each one would have some association with nearly one thousand students in his own residential unit.

If the educational impact of living in a small residential unit is to be of significance, it is essential that there be agreement among its constituent groups regarding the goals of education. It has been amply and repeatedly demonstrated that employees of a company are more productive when morale is high and relations between employees and employers are good than when strife and suspicion are present. Nevitt Sanford mentioned the Hawthorne effect last night. There certainly is a Hawthorne effect in schools, too. Students do better if you are doing something with them, even though it's not very good, than if you do things very well and they don't know about it. Similarly, patients in psychiatric hospitals respond better to psychotherapy when members of the professional staff are in essential agreement and get along well with one another than when there is conflict and feuding.

In another part of the Harvard Student Study, an examination of the organizational effects on student attitudes exerted by the Harvard Houses, Vreeland and Bidwell have shown that the Houses do indeed affect student values and attitudes.[9] Their findings suggest that the affective -- that is, emotional climate of a House, is the central mechanism of value and attitude change. The amount of change is greatest in those Houses in which there is an apparent integration of goals, and least in those in which there is a disagreement between Master and staff, or between either group and student leaders. When the attitudes of the Master and staff are divergent, the effect on student attitude changes is not as extensive as when they are congruent. The staff members are less powerful as a source of cross-pressure than is the Master. When the students form a contraculture, but lack an integrated social structure, value and attitude change is towards staff goals.

One might postulate from these findings that if a college is to have an effect upon its students in promoting any particular values or attitudes that are considered desirable, much attention should be paid to gaining a reasonable and flexible consensus of their desirability among administration, faculty, and students. Propagandists for vicious causes have learned how to promote a consensus in a given population, even for causes which relatively few individuals initially though desirable. It remains to be seen whether institutions of higher learning can effectively inculcate values and attitudes that promote dignity and respect for all persons and at the same time enhance the intellectual development of all their students.[10]

I am not aware of any study that conclusively shows whether co-educational programs are superior to those at one-sex colleges. My opinion is that it is desirable for young men and women to be educated in the same institutions and for many opportunities to be provided for frequent social contact with appropriate privacy. If architectural conditions permit, I would like to see bedrooms off-limits to members of the opposite sex, and living rooms available for dates at times mutually agreed upon by the Master and his staff and the students, with attention being paid to opinions of parents, faculty members, and members of the administration. There is no point in colleges' attempting to prevent students from having sexual relations with one another. Those who want to will have them. A practical and reasonable goal is that of developing a community in which young men and women may become well enough acquainted with one another to permit permanent and satisfying marriages to be made. Sexual education of a realistic nature should supplement the excessively crude and cynical bombardment of young and old with hedonistic sexual stimuli in the mass media and nearly every form of so-called entertainment. What realistic sexual education means is not within the province of our present discussion, but it certainly does not include the implied sanction of the college or university for pre-marital sexual relations.

The Committee on the College Student, of the Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, stated that students' privacy requires respect, and that sexual activity privately practiced with appropriate attention to the sensitivities of other people should not be the direct concern of the administration.[11] This idea was attacked by the Boston papers with great vigor. Their attack was built almost entirely on misinformation; they had not read the report. Their insistence that colleges assume this undesirable concern made them appear to be advocating unlimited, uncontrolled spying and snooping by college officials. But a free society cannot operate in that way. And the college student is already alarmed about man's loss of privacy in an urban age, and the frightening possibilities for surveillance and domination by modern technology; seeing college officials use these techniques may lead the student to a rejection of all faith in authority and in society.

Still, society does not sanction irregular sexual activities, and the college cannot be placed in the position of condoning or encouraging them. And sexual activity that is not private is likely to be disturbing to others. There should be sufficient external control "so that students are neither burdened nor frightened by their freedom."[11] It is desirable that the college make quite explicit its attitude toward sex on campus. Instead of an intruding spy system, the college and student authorities should take remedial action, up to and including dismissal from the college, when individuals and society are grossly offended. Each case should be considered on its own merits. Principles rather than rules should govern, but these must be continually redefined with both student and faculty participation, and with due regard for the law and community sentiment. There are no clear and definitive answers. The issues can and should be understood.

Another important unifying factor (which has disintegrative effects if used inappropriately) is the nature of the expression of differences of opinion. Informed dissent is vital to learning, as well as to the ultimate survival of a society. Dissent for its own sake, or motivated by personal emotional conflicts, may be harmful. Dissent can be respectful or it can be destructive. It is not lost on students when bitter personal rivalries are expressed among faculty members in the form of intellectual dissent, and some students may assume that diatribes against colleagues are within permissable bounds. The vicious attacks sometimes made in professional journals (especially in book reviews) often go far beyond the limits of relevent criticism or good taste. When no responses to such violations of decency are forthcoming, students can only assume that they are legitimate and proper. Thus there occurs a deterioration in the quality of communication which is quite regrettable.

In regard to the architectural features, I can outline some of the things that I would say to the architect if we were going to develop a residential college. First, the unit should have room for about four hundred students. Every residential unit ought to have some means of privacy, if you can afford it. (Here in North Carolina you seem to be handicapped because of arbitrary regulations which serve to prevent you from getting what you want in residential architecture. You may have to work with your legislators on that!) The type of small living unit that appeals to me has a common living room for four to six students, where there can be a fair amount, but not complete privacy, with small, single bedrooms for each student. Amherst College, Harvard, St. John's of Minnesota, and quite a number of other colleges have dormitories like this. Each person has room for his desk and personal belongings in his own bedroom and the rooms vary in color, to help create a residential rather than an institutional atmosphere. The groups of four to six are further aggregated into groups of sixteen to twenty-four, with all persons coming in and out of residential units through a main entrance. This plan avoids the undesirable features of dormitories built on long corridors which are invariably noisy and lead to undesirable kinds of socialization. If you can have relatively small units, there can be opportunities for more friendship and more privacy too.

There should be space for the Master and his family, rooms for tutors and residents, rooms for interviews between students and non-resident tutors, and two or three common rooms. Other rooms with particular purposes need some special mention.

I strongly favor having a dining room with alcoves here and there for groups of guests or for seminars, with special attention to a variety of ways of distributing food quickly at the lowest possible cost With imaginative planning, all students and guests can be served from a common serving table and carry their food to tables where there's enough privacy to permit serious discussion. Those who are not participating in such groups can eat in the large common dining room. Each house should have three to five such semi-private eating spaces. There should be some hobby rooms for music, painting, photography, dramatics, and so on.

Then there is the question of the library. Here your budget will carry more weight than any theories! There should be special attention to supplying books on reserve for various courses, saving students time and relieving general strain on the central library. No system of house libraries can be successful unless the students participate both in the planning and the maintenance. Vandalism in libraries is notorious, and only the students can keep this problem minimized. It might be possible to cultivate in students the habit of leaving some of their personal books when they leave -- books which they will probably not need again but which will be helpful to the group that comes next year.

In the development of a residential "house" or "college," attention must be paid to the distinction between those functions which are primarily to be carried out in it and those dependent upon membership in the entire institution. If the functions of the two parts of the university are not clear, there is the risk of making the smaller unit so isolated that it offers no advantage over the isolated small college. On the other hand, if too many of the needs of the students are dependent upon the larger university, the reason for the small unit disappears and the tendency toward impersonality and anonymity increases.

As the functions to be planned for the residential house are being delineated, it is highly desirable that free and frequent communication be maintained between the architects and the groups for whom the structure is being planned. Not only should the future Master (or whatever term is applied to the senior faculty resident) be consulted constantly, but the opinions of students should be sought throughout the planning. The argument that students are in residence such a short time that their opinions carry little weight is not a sound one; their residence is the very reason for the building of the structure. They know what they want and need, and these desiderata are more likely to be acceptable to future students than ideas derived solely from the still more detached viewpoints of faculty members.

I could add many more ideas and say all these things many different ways, but you have to stop somewhere. These are just the free associations I have about what I hope you will do as you are planning for your own residential units. Remember, one of the parodies of Parkinson's Law is that whatever you want to do, you've got to do a lot of other things first.

Footnotes:

1. Pusey, N. M., The Age of the Scholar (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), pp. 141-42.

2. Hutchins, R. M., The Higher Learning in America (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), pp. 77-78.

3. Farnsworth, D. L., "The Search for Identity," in The Age of Anxiety. 1965-66 Guest Lecture Series, The Forest Hospital Foundation, Des Plaines, Illinois.

4. King, S. H., "Personality Stability: Early Findings of the Harvard Student Study." Delivered at the American College Health Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D. C., (March, 1967).

5. Finnie, B., "Interests of Harvard Students as Freshmen and Seniors." ibid.

6. King, S. H., "Characteristics of Students Seeking Psychiatric Help During College," ibid.

7. Vreeland, R. S., "Dating Patterns of Harvard Men," ibid.

8. McArthur, C., Personal communication from unpublished data.

9. Vreeland, R., and Bidwell, C., "Organizational Effects of Student Activities: A Study of Harvard Houses," Sociology of Education, 38:233-250, 1965.

10. Farnsworth, D. L., Psychiatry, Education, and the Young Adult, (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1966) p. 233.

11. Committee on the College Student, College Students and Sex, Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, Report No. 60.

12. Ibid.

Comments by Discussants

GORDON ROHMAN: In your description of a residential college, Dr. Farnsworth, you make no mention of a curriculum. It's curious because in our situation, we began with that. I noticed that yesterday Dr. Sanford made a good deal of the developmental functions of the curriculum as part of the residential setting. Also, in talking with the students here I have discovered that their notion of the residential college at this stage of development does not include a curriculum; although there apparently is some desire for the inclusion of it. I must say that although we began with the typically academic notion that a college is somehow a curriculum, a collection of courses, I am much more persuaded that this is not the necessary point at which to begin -- perhaps it isn't even an important point. I wonder if you would care to respond to the absence of the curricular program, and then perhaps we could discuss what makes the function of the curriculum unique to the college. I guess you are assuming the curriculum of the university as that which surrounds the residential setting at Harvard. Is that correct?

DANA FARNSWORTH: I made the assumptions that you were going to talk about curriculum and that in a residential college you already have a curriculum. I should have mentioned that I would like to see quite a number of the curricular functions brought into the residential college. That's the reason I wanted common rooms and rooms for seminars, rooms which can transfer to the college as many of the curricular activities as possible. It is a very difficult task, however, at least in a large and highly structured university, to take anything away from the established departments, particularly if it looks like duplication to them. So I would hasten to make this complete by saying I would urge you not to substitute the college curriculum for that of the university -- but rather, to see there are some things that could be taught better in the house or college and others that can be taught better in the university context. But I don't know where the balance lies.

The seminar program at Harvard would be useful to explore. Each seminar is directed by a senior faculty member who shares his knowledge, enthusiasm, and time with students. David Riesman will take up one of his topics and work through with great enthusiasm for one group; Dean Bundy in his time talked with students on some problem in government. The youngsters were not required to be graded in these seminars. The instructors could tell perfectly well whether they were learning anything or what they were doing. These were most enthusiastically received. All this reminds me that about twenty years ago I wrote a paper (which I recently re-read) in which I found the sentence, "It is quite possible that we are perpetuating poor education in order to get good grading." I think we are doing that in quite a number of divisions of the university.

GORDON ROHMAN: Last summer, I had a delightful conversation with Mr.

Eric Ashby, Master at Claire College, Cambridge. We sat for a long summer's afternoon out under a plum tree in the Master's garden at Cambridge, which in itself is an experience. But we were grappling with this same problem and he was trying to explain the traditional function of the residential college as it relates to the university. The distinction that he made was one that I promised I would never make in public at Michigan State, that we will leave the teaching to the university, but do the educating in the college. This sounds like President Pusey's statement (if I can borrow a phrase from Dr. Sanford), "One cheer for teaching and two cheers for thoughtfulness."

NEVITT SANFORD: Dr. Farnsworth, like myself, has been somewhat general in his statement about goals, about what we are going to do. But on this point, I think there is a disagreement between Dr. Farnsworth and me right away; he's grimmer about goals than I am. I tried to see how many things we could embrace under the idea of love and self knowledge. Many of his goals I could have also embraced. However, both of us left out the goals of emotional freedom, satisfaction, and creativity. Did you notice that his list looks terribly serious and grim?

The other side also has its place -- the things, that, according to Alexander Wolcott, seem to be either illegal, immoral, or fattening -- all that side of life has to be incorporated here, as becomes evident when we discuss the actual quality of life in one of these residential colleges which is co-educational. My dream is to take these huge structures and put girls on one floor and boys on the other, the way it has been done at the University of Washington. This can be managed perfectly, and then build quonset huts or some kind of temporary structure adjacent to or connected with those buildings for intellectual activities. Let's get over the idea that we've got to build for eternity, in order to have any space in which things can happen.

The big issue that we have to deal with in talking with academic people is how we can talk about character and its development, and be interested in the student the way that we are without leading our academic colleagues to feel that we are being soft-headed or that we want to down-grade the intellectual in the interest of some sort of psychiatric havoc. I still feel this when I talk to Eastern people. We are getting away from this in the West a little. The people in the West think that the American College, for example, is about the oldest and most established piece of literature we have about higher education. You know how fast things change! But when I talk to people in the eastern liberal arts colleges, I get the feeling that nothing has changed since we were at Vassar; everytime we talk about the student as a person, somebody says we are being clinical. Or if we talk about trying to arrange things so that life on the campus would be a little more valuable and endurable, it is said that we want to make the whole college into some kind of psychological experiment.

One thing we should do is try to be quite explicit about the way in which learning in the class room actually is an instrument for developing the person. I think it can be done and it's something we should do.

About size, here at North Carolina you are already in trouble because of the size of the residential buildings that have been built. Four hundred students is enough for most purposes. Four hundred in one place. One might conceivably sub-divide in some rational way by tearing out some of the interiors of those buildings. In Riesman and Jenks' discussion of the Harvard House system in The American College, they approve this number of four hundred. They say that four hundred would do for Yale, but three hundred fifty would do for Harvard because Harvard students are not as sociable as Yale students. I gather from Dr. Farnsworth that as a result of his work and that of others the Harvard students have become a little more sociable now!

Group Discussion

DANA FARNSWORTH (in response to a comment about the need for time and space to be alone, for reflection and reading in residential halls): A few years ago a college student said that he would not buy anything but a twenty-three hour deodorant because he felt that a man ought to have at least one hour to himself each day. I'm strongly in favor of learning how to be alone. It is no sign of emotional maturity that a person must conform to a pattern set by others. In fact, the emotionally mature person is one who should be able to be himself at all times. The essence of mental illness is isolation in all its various forms; yet in attempts to avoid isolation, people have so accustomed themselves to activity for its own sake that they cannot tolerate even occasional privacy. The versatility of being able to enjoy varieties of association as well as periods of being alone is not present in many people. As a result, they are driven by the urge to be active during all their waking hours. It is almost as if we have millions of people afflicted with social hypomania. Even though I didn't mention it very much, I certainly think that the one commodity we may have the most difficulty acquiring in the next few years is privacy. And when we lose all our privacy, we'll noisily go crazy together. I think that those of you who are planning a residential college have not only to think in terms of achieving physical privacy but also to remember that reflection is an integral part of the educational process. Constant accumulation of information, skills, and togetherness isn't going to make us into educated people. I'd like to emphasize what we've said here on this alternation between privacy and being with other people. The mentally sick person, by and large, is the one who just can't manage to make associations with other people. Isolation when it is unwanted is very harmful. Isolation when it is desired and can be used is one of the best experiences that we can enjoy.

DANA FARNSWORTH (in response to a student's question about privacy in students' rooms for members of the opposite sex): What I am trying to say is that young men and women need privacy. In most of our homes, for example, when a date arrives, the parents don't say, "Well, you all go up to your bedroom because we're going to use the living room." This implies something a little different than what is intended. So the parents go up to the bedroom and the dating couple stay down in the living room. Obviously, they do what they want to in the living room. There's no doubt about that! And they may do it often . . . but the sanction is not there; they are not told by the parents, "This is what is expected of you."

What I'm concerned about is that many students have said in effect that because we have parietal rules, the University expects you to use this freedom to indulge in sexual episodes. The college freshman feels, many times, that no one has given him permission to say "no." What I'm striving for is freedom for the young student to make up his or her own mind as to his conduct. This has to be freedom that is based on the knowledge of what the issues are. Up at Colby College, some years ago, they tried to trap Margaret Mead in this situation. "Don't you think this is our home away from home, and it's perfectly all right for us to have our dates in the bedroom?" She replied "Boy-Girl-Bed-Baby -- that's an association that's been present for a long time, and will continue to be." Now this does not mean that I'm advocating elimination of parietal rules. We don't have, except in a few places, the ideal architectural set-up for such a move. I'm saying that if you are planning colleges now, if you care anything about your kids who will be coming here in twenty-five years, if you will plan a system in which your children will have the choice, then you can help them make the choice by developing good relationships with them when they're one, two, five, eight, ten years old. All our studies indicate that when a young person's relationship with his parents is good -- when they have ideals, he has ideals -- he's able to manage himself quite well. When the relationships are poor and they have no ideals, the kids are not taught any ideals. Then they go away to college, and all sorts of things can and do happen. I'm striving for greater freedom -- that's what it amounts to, the kind of freedom in which the university treats students with great respect, but does not overestimate their sophistication in this area. I don't think that's too grim!

DANA FARNSWORTH (in response to a question about the relationship between size and the money available for residential housing): In the ideal system that I mentioned earlier, we have about four hundred students per unit, with separate entries for each sixteen to twenty. But the other unit, the entire university, is fifteen thousand students. In short, every citizen, every student is a member of many communities. In this ideal set-up, he has his family, either three or five other students, who are in effect his roommates. He also has his entry mates, the larger group in the residence hall, and the larger university. Then if it's a co-educational institution, there's a similar group, the girls upstairs or the girls downstairs, etc. Thus, the student has an almost unlimited variety of types of association, just as all of us have a wide variety of types of associations, but at the same time need to belong somewhere to some small group. What is so damaging to higher education is for a student to come to an institution and just be one of a great, milling mob. At no time does he talk with anybody, an older person, whom he feels really cares about him. My colleague, Robert White, said once, "A student goes to his assigned counsellor to talk with him about things he thinks a student and a counselor should talk about, but he goes to a respected faculty member associate to talk about things that really concern him." I'm trying to get away from that artificiality. But I can't answer your question because I don't think there is any ideal one size.

Going back to cost, the least expensive dormitory unit with which I am familiar is a building designed by Marcel Breuer at St. John's University in Minnesota. They have a unit for four hundred that cost $3,400 per student. Conditions are fairly simple and the building is not as solid as it should be. They have now built another dormitory which will last at least a good three or four hundred years, using steel reinforced concrete. There the cost is closer to somewhat between $6,000 and $7,000 per student, which is much more realistic. Some colleges build residences which go up to $14,000 per student, but that's too high. I think a realistic limit per student in our various state universities will have to be something between $5,000 and $7,000 (and remember that costs increase each year) if we are going to have buildings that will last. While I agree that we don't have to build for eternity, I feel that dormitories ought to be built in such a way that they will be useful forty to sixty years from now. Actually, if they are built appropriately, and if you don't have to move the college, they'll be good for a long time. We have them going back as far as 1720 and they are still pretty good, after having their interior rebuilt every century or so.

DANA FARNSWORTH (in response to a question about pre-marital sexual relations among students): What I have tried to make clear in some of the papers I have written is that sexual relations between young persons under age (and I'm not making an issue of 21 or anything of that sort) should be considered undesirable. I didn't say "wrong" or "right" or anything of that sort, but "undesirable." This would be the basic premise on which university policy is based. We shouldn't have a spy system to see what happens; however, when somebody violates the privacy of another individual and there is an objection, then the discipline committee (whether it's a student-faculty one, a student court, or whatever), takes action based upon this general principle.

If you have a system or social code which says pre-marital sexual relations are desirable for those who are mature and have a strong affection for one another, and undesirable for those who are immature and whose affection is still not well developed, then you put the students in a position of having to classify themselves just at the time when nature has designed that they should be most optimistic. This means that students have no clear guidelines whatsoever. It also means that if they think we are saying, "anything goes," then we must take a serious view when something goes wrong. I remember once at M.I.T., for example, we had a girl get pregnant; the boy did not want to marry her, but she wanted to marry him. The dean said, when she got along about the seventh month, "Well, you can take a leave of absence now and come back after the baby is born." He said to the boy, "You'll take a leave of absense, too, because, you know, both of you were responsible." The boy was horrified! His parents were incensed at the very idea that the boy could be held responsible. But the dean made it stick. I don't know whether he was right or wrong. But I think the university should act just as society does. You're patient, you're reasonable, you have standards, you don't get excited if the standards are violated, but you try to help the youngster learn from his unfortunate experience. If you have no standards, then confusion reigns. You have ethical relativism at every turn -- nobody knows where they stand and it's a mess!

GORDON ROHMAN (in response to a question about adapting existing dormitories as residential colleges): In our case, we began with such speed that we had no alternative but to use existing structures. We were in business in a calendar year from the idea of the college to the enrolling of the freshman class, so we simply moved into an older dormitory. I suspect that more often what we lack are not resources but resourcefulness in using existing structures. Since we didn't have a new building and a new budget and a bright young architect, perhaps we had to concentrate on the more important problem of what a college is, apart from being a structure or building. I think the more important definition does indeed lie here. In our case, we simply converted a floor of bedrooms to offices, a few common rooms to classrooms, took advantages of classrooms that were available in the university, and we were in business. We made no change in the structuring of men and women, however, and at this point none is contemplated. We took a dormitory that had already been divided co-educationally -- women on one side and men on the other -- joined by a common lounge and dining facilities in the middle. We're in business as a college, in a place (a college is a place, please note!) with no more than $10,000, maybe more like $5,000 worth of rennovation. It was mainly cutting a few doors through walls, some painting, and buying a few desks. To begin with, I had an old ROTC olive drab desk and you can do as much important thinking on that kind of a desk as you can on the very expensive-looking walnut desk I now have. You can get distracted by considerations of rennovations. The cost need not be high in money; the cost is, however, extraordinarily high in imaginative resourcefulness as to what you do and in negotiating time to convince the administration or students or faculty of the legitimacy of the idea. This is the more important sense of cost, but it's not money!

DANA FARNSWORTH: Any quonset hut, any log will do so long as you have the right people on each end. In the transforming of the Harvard dormitories into Houses, all sorts of improvising went on. One can carve out, as Dean Rohman said, a group of structures which have the required amount of space for students and then, with imaginative architectural work, one can get some common rooms or a common dining room or whatever is needed to give this unit some individuality, both architecturally and educationally. Sometimes working under handicaps of that sort where you do have to improvise may give you better results than when everything is furnished. We are a nation of people that are constitutionally unable to stand being treated well. A former president of S.D.S. once complained bitterly about students having been cheated of the privilege of doing things themselves. We are born with too much, he says. Well, I sympathize with him; I don't think that there's any satisfaction greater than hammering away against opposition and accomplishing something. So don't cheat your own people out of the kind of actions which will give them a sense of accomplishment. Some educators say, "students go to school to learn a trade or a profession; why are we so concerned about emotional resources? That's the kind of thing that should be taught at home. Why are colleges getting so upset about the mental health of their students?" I think we are beginning to appreciate that knowledge without judgment or wisdom may not be very helpful -- in fact it may be quite the opposite.

DANA FARNSWORTH (in response to a question about why colleges should be so concerned about the emotional resources and mental health of students if this isn't a form of super-idealism): While I wouldn't want to be called a super-idealist, I would hope to be an idealist. You have to have ideals that are a lot higher than you can realize in a practical sense. What I'm driving at is this: I am a psychiatrist, but I would like to eliminate psychiatrists by removing the need for them. I'm not worried about getting out of a job. But more and more of the tasks of developing emotional maturity should be done, not through clinical procedures, but in educational ways. In short, I would like to have institutions that would develop more John Gardners and fewer George Lincoln Rockwells, more persons who are imaginative, idealistic, resourceful, and who will fight hard and inspire others to fight hard. If we could have just one John Gardner per year per institution for the next ten years, we'd have it made. Too many persons think that because you are fighting for the freedom of the individual, you're soft-headed not to mention soft-hearted. It just isn't so. I'd like to make one more criticism of people who think that because a person is trying to develop emotional maturity that somehow or other he is anti-intellectual. That isn't so either. You simply cannot say that John Gardner is anti-intellectual. He is an emotionally mature man who can use his intellectual power constructively. Another way of saying this is that we're trying to develop communities where students, instead of having to protest in self-defeating ways, can protest in creative ways.

THE TWO CLOCKS OF JUSTIN MORRILL

D. Gordon Rohman

When I was picked up the other day at the airport by Parker Hudson, we immediately began talking about colleges. It wasn't long before I realized that the context for his use of the term "college" was not my context and we were obviously not talking with each other, but against each other. So we must begin by raising the question, "What is a college?" or specifically, "What is a residential college?"

Mine is the story of one special kind of college in a special setting with a special mission. It may or may not be applicable to your special setting and situation. Our particular mission was to complement the University, to fill a gap in the total educational structure at Michigan State, a gap that was perceived to be not only real but urgent. That gap was described here last evening by some of the students who said that frequently schooling systems turn them off. How can we manage more efficiently to do the job we say we are doing to keep students not only "turned on" but to develop in them a humane intelligence? What I'm going to talk about is not a style of building but, if you'll pardon the turning of the phrase, building a style.

We have not had the luxury of planning new architecture. Consequently, we have not been distracted by questions of outer space or even parking space. We're talking about inner space. I'd like to begin by giving you a quote from a book written by Sidney Cox called Indirections for Those Who Want to Write and it's one of the best books on that topic that I know. In this book, there is a sentence which goes like this, "Human beings live in two realities, one of seeming fixity with institutions, dogmas, rules of punctuation and routines, the calendared and clock-wise world of all but futile round on round. And one of whirling electrons, dreams and possibilities behind the clock." The situation of students as developing human beings is captured in this observation, and I suspect also that this is not a bad way of characterizing all human beings. The art is to balance the two realities, i.e., "WHAT IS with what MIGHT BE." It requires wisdom, discipline, and some wonder. Those involved with developing institutions know all about the problem of living in these two realities or, as I am calling this speech, with these two clocks, in time and on time but also out of time, in ideal time. The challenge at Justin Morrill is to make the art of living with these two "clocks" our educational style.

Rather than focusing on the achieved programs of Justin Morrill, what we have calendared and clocked so far, I would rather attempt to describe the dynamics of our clocking, the life of mediation between the two realities -- between college and university, college and student, college and teacher, teacher and student, and on and on. We are not trying to develop for Justin Morrill a finished program, some kind of integration tomorrow, which would once and for all convert what MIGHT BE into WHAT IS. Rather, we are trying to develop a style of response based on the continuing need for transactions between possibilities. We hope thus to complement the University as our Guidelines say we must in fact do, and in the process to complement the students and the faculty engaged in the enterprise with us. Can we ignore any longer what perceptive students and faculty alike are saying, that schooling systems do indeed frequently "turn them off," and frequently the very ones most valuable to have in a community? John Holt writes a book, How Students Fail; Nevitt Sanford writes a book Where Colleges Fail; Parker Hudson stands up in this conference and says UNC fails him. We could document this analysis endlessly.

The residential college idea is one response to this challenge and failure. The university structure for learning is incomplete and needs a complement. But why the residential college? Because to my way of thinking, a college occupies an immensely strategic position. It is in the central position between the university and the student, the student and the teacher, etc. As a place, it is a stage for mediation as students and faculty seek to develop rational responsiveness to the two realities of WHAT IS and what MIGHT BE. I seldom hear this aspect discussed, but it seems that one of the great advantages of the residential college idea lies precisely in its strategic, central position. It keeps everybody asking the right questions. The developing residential college that is negotiating its own identity while its students are negotiating theirs can become not only an arena but a model of mediation as a style of human and humane development. As we work out constantly and daily the equations of WHAT IS and WHAT MIGHT BE on our two clocks, it's not bad preparation for a problematic future.

The first most important fact about Justin Morrill College is that it exists. It is in time; it is something that is. Now, that's not exactly the end of wisdom. But in our case, perhaps, it's the beginning. With existence, all things are conceivable; without it, by definition, nothing. Calendared, and clockwise, then, we began April 22, 1965, in an old dormitory. The College is, however, only partially described in a record of events from then until now -- programs added, subtracted, multiplied, and divided in the "new math" of institutional development. More subtly, ours is a story of challenges and responses within the university environment that have kept us on edge for two years. Hopefully in the process it has put an edge on us and on our ideas. Our creation built imbalance into the system known as Michigan State, into the persons challenged to define the College, and into the students initiated into a new style of learning. Everyone has been scrambling ever since, around the clock and behind it, for new equilibriums.

I'd like to illustrate this in five areas of strategic challenge which are rich in educational potential; to the students and faculty, yes, but also, hopefully, to the University that created us. First, there was the basic challenge concerning whether we would merely administer a program whose general outlines were clear enough at the time we were invented, or create a program in the spirit of what Dr. Sanford calls "developmental education for all concerned." We were born, but a person by no means achieves a character at birth. He perhaps achieves a status and place in time, but character is something he achieves in the light of certain choices. The Guidelines establishing our general features had been approved at all levels of university government before I entered the scene. A week before the trustees approved our creation, I was handed the Guidelines and directed to recruit a faculty and plan a curriculum for 400 freshmen who would enter in September. Between April 22 and September 30, 1965, we did. But the college was by no means created then. It was only launched. There was not what the sociologists quaintly call a "normative consensus" at that point as to the values that were deliberately created in conflict.

What do I mean, "We had to create a college?" Let me illustrate from the Guidelines themselves, which combine general philosophical objectives and specific program details. Some of these had mainly to be administered, for example, the directive that the new college should run an intensive language program. Other guidelines spoke of "development and understanding of the nature of knowledge" and of "learning to the end that graduate are intellectually critical and usually insightful with respect to the justifications for their beliefs and reservations." How do you set that one into the calendared and clockwise world? The more specific the Guidelines were, the more they suggested we should run another version of yesterday's general education college. The more abstract they were, the more they teased us with the possibility of creating a strategically experimental college for today. A small college within the university had often been proposed at Michigan State over the past decade, with, as one would expect, the motivations and justifications of the times. The college that was finally enacted in April, 1965, reflected in many ways the motivations and justifications of the previous decade.

F. M. Cornford, in his remarkable little guide for the young academic politician, MicroCosmographia Academica, observes, "Nothing is ever done until everyone is convinced that it ought to be done and has been convinced for so long that it is now time to do something else." Now politically, of course, it usually is impossible to get today's ideas enacted today, not to mention tomorrow's ideas, assuming we know what tomorrow's ideas are today. Usually organizations prefer to perpetuate the safer, known and fixed boundaries of the past into the unsafe, problematic future, to assure security, conventionality, continuity. Practically, we have to settle for the best we can get and the establishment of Justin Morrill in 1965 was a good beginning. Our Guidelines are a remarkable document in spite of the compromises within them. They frequently and strongly entertain a high conception of possibility for experimental, developmental, liberal education. The seeds of greatness are within us, but so also inevitably are the fruits of the past. Let me give some examples. Many of our Guidelines refer to core courses, integrated year-long courses that provide structure and synthesis for general education understood as a certain body of knowledge. But the nomenclature "core" and the "integrated course" come out of the General Education movement after World War II, and at Michigan State, they reflect the particular experience we have had as a leader in General Education in our own university college. Such courses have their value, but they are a means to an end. Both the means, integrated courses, and the ends, General Education, need or at least admit of new analysis. In Justin Morrill we believe there are real limitations to integrated courses, i.e. inefficiency in faculty involvement and a real question about General Education conceived of as a certain body of knowledge. Nevertheless, the voice of the past speaks, although in ambiguous notes, in our Guidelines. We chose to respond to guidelines asking us to investigate the nature of knowledge and learning in a residential setting. We believed the times demanded a curriculum flexible enough to complement the developmental needs of the student, the faculty, and the university. To do so, we believed a new approach to the ideal of integration was needed. Integration was too important to be left to anything as fixed as a course or curriculum to provide. To be a maturing experience, integration of knowledge and insight must in each individual case be achieved by a student, not received from others. So we have attempted to create a program where achievement by transactional negotiation or mediation is the style of our educational experience. Our determination was supported by the Provost of Michigan State at the inaugural convocation of Madison College, the third residential college to be created at Michigan State opening this fall. He said, "We are convinced that beyond high school, there is no one best way to continue the education of youth. Too many purposes are to be served by higher education. A university should be able to embrace a great variety of approaches and it should be seeking out as many of these as possible."

The second mediating challenge is between what is in existing colleges and departments, which persist in conceiving us in their curricular models, and our desire to be a developmental college in the way I have described and that is a crucial fact in our negotiating success. We have the support of the President, the Provost, and the deans; we have a dean of our own and our own separate budget. As the Dean of the College, I report directly to the Provost, not the another dean, and I sit with the council of deans. In the College we can hire, promote, and tenure faculty. We directly control two-thirds of the students' total undergraduate requirements and can authorize and confer the Bachelor of Arts.

We are officially described as "semi-autonomous." But "semi-autonomy" is an ambiguous term. Although existing colleges within the university are never completely autonomous, neither are they ever described as semi-autonomous. Because we are, it is inferred by some that we are less autonomous than the existing autonomous colleges; if not their satellite, then at least we are their inferior. We cannot, however, negotiate developmentally from a position of inequality, so it is important for us in our mediating process within the university to have this posture of equality; indeed we have been given it. As I've tried to indicate, it is a fact of our negotiating situation. The issue, however, in this tension is being joined on what we call the "non-duplication and prolifiration clause" in our Guidelines. We are not supposed to duplicate courses and programs offered elsewhere in the University. The University Curriculum Committee -- a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, to whom we, along with all other colleges, must submit proposals for program modification -- has been very sensitive on this issue. In our case, it sometimes appeared that the Committee had refused our request for new programs not because they duplicated existing ones elsewhere but because they feared we had infringed on departmental claims to "ownership" of certain areas of subject matter. It is something of a fine line which separates duplication and different treatment of similar subject matter. From one point of view, the very creation of the college duplicated subject matter in the University, not only in the general education program of University College, but also in the Colleges of Arts and Letters, Social Science, and Natural Science, since we are commanded in the Guidelines to pay attention to all these areas. But we are not duplicating methods, approaches, techniques, or even in some cases, subject matter. We are trying, as the Guidelines command us, to complement the university. We have absolutely no desire to duplicate it. Such would not only be a violation of our Guidelines but a failure of the creative challenge to negotiate between the university world and the student world. But it is undoubtedly true that we are perceived by many in the departments as invaders, intent upon carving new empires out of their old ones. So far, the challenges have been discreet but with the creation of two new residential colleges this fall, they may seem to present a greater threat than Justin Morrill alone did in the past. Among other things, we in the residential colleges must make clear our intention to complement and not duplicate, and also do more imaginative complementing, less often appearing to be duplicating and unnecessarily irritating the departments.

The third negotiating challenge we might call the "sociological one," between our kind of administrative model for college education and existing bureaucratic structures for university education. Can we successfully take up what I am trying to characterize as the interposition and graft a new administrative concept onto existing and powerful ones? Ours is an attempt to hypenate living-learning, but the university over the years has permitted a de facto separation of living from learning. So Justin Morrill has found itself engaged in ceaseless and not always successful negotiation with existing administrative units of the university because the college by design falls short on most of them. We had to define new recruiting and selection principles with the Office of Admission. We have caused trouble with the Registrar because the greater flexibility of our program gums up his machine. The management of the residence halls has traditionally controlled all space, made all room assignments, run the food service, and established room rent, according to the demands of break-even economics. The only variation in this pattern at Michigan State occurred when the so-called living-learning dormitories were built and certain existing academic programs were placed in them. But they were clearly academic programs in a residential setting. We are, or hope to be, something else, i.e., the total program designed for the residential setting. This major philosophical difference has not been accepted yet by management because of the consequences involved in taking it seriously. We're not actively seeking to use the entire space of the residence hall for educational purposes. We are in business to break down the commuter relation between a student and his education. But the management is also in business, and often it appears that our proposals, educationally motivated, conflict with practices which are business motivated. We have negotiated some major compromises in this regard, but we are still far from controlling our environment as we would like to.

The fourth mediating challenge is the professional one felt by faculty called upon to work in the new college. It is often said that faculty in the University owe their primary loyalty to their profession, not to their place of employment, i.e., the particular university that pays them. They think of themselves as professors of political science, English, or chemistry, rather than as teachers at Michigan State. As long as a professor of political science is working in a department of political science there need be no daily conflict between his professional and his teaching role. But our situation presents a problem. Can we recruit enough teachers from the University for part-time college-style involvement and provide them with sufficient professional identity to keep their morale high and permit them to mingle as equals in the larger university community? Because we draw mainly from a university and are commissioned to learn how to live and relate to that university, we have decided not to hire a separate faculty. We have already done that once at Michigan State in the University College. It solved one kind of problem, but created many others, problems of identity and of morale especially. We're trying to work with a small corps of full-time faculty directing special studies within the college, but also functioning as facilitators in this mediating developmental process as students move from parent to autonomy and relate from college to university. For the balance of teaching, we use faculty jointly appointed to departments around the University. To get the best from this kind of faculty person, we invite him to give topic-centered courses in areas of his special interest. By doing this, we have to make teaching and a General Education program as attractive as possible for university-style scholar-teachers. Out of their enthusiasm and commitment to special areas of their disciplines, not to mention their special competence in these same areas, we hope to bring to our students an unusually high degree of involvement in Justin Morrill courses, higher at least than we might reasonably expect of a part-time faculty if we asked them to take a section or two of a core course in which they had no experience and perhaps little interest.

We wanted above all to make the presence of teachers felt in our classrooms. This is the most important ingredient in it, to get persons in the classroom as models of learners on just about any terms that they care to negotiate. I still think this is the right principle for us in our attempt to work imaginatively in the University. But I would be less than candid if I didn't say our particular form of joint-appointments does not permit the idea to work very effectively yet. In our first two years, I must have negotiated over 100 different contractual changes of status for faculty to teach for various lengths of time at Justin Morrill. Although many teachers have served the college with distinction, others are simply given new sections of old courses. And often their stay in the college is so brief, it doesn't pay them to take the time to create new ones.

In addition, we have an economic problem, for under the present joint-appointment system, the department establishes the teaching load of its faculty and I must hire them on that basis. Since teaching loads vary considerably across the university, we pay differently in different departments for the same amount of teaching done in the college. Not only is this expensive, it also creates bad feeling when different teachers discover the different prices they command on the market. In addition, even when it has paid for a man's time, the college has not secured him for much besides classroom instruction. Faculty and department heads teach, write, advise, sit on committees, etc. -- and their total compensation is based upon this total load. But in the small college, we actually secure only the teaching part although we pay for the entire package of responsibilities. Partly this has resulted because we were trying to make service in the new college attractive to already busy men. And partly we were concerned to prevent doubling a man's time rather than splitting it when he went on joint-appointment, a very real danger as any of you who have been on joint-appointments know. But our concern has in effect inflated our unit cost, and we are currently seeking new forms of university faculty involvement in the college that will permit us to use the great pool of faculty talent and temperament represented in the large University -- something over 2,000 people who are in one way or another faculty at Michigan State -- but at a cost and in a way that will insure the integrity and the economy of our program.

I mention all of these negotiating tensions both because they are a very real consequence of our creation, but also because I think they are for us in the college and for the University, potentially developmental experiences. Out of these tensions, we can learn not just how to run a college, but perhaps how better to run a university which includes a college. I hope that we are in fact complementing each other. I hope also that in our experience in this ceaseless negotiation and mediation between the two realities of what is and what might be, in constantly seeking to live in that divided world, we are presenting to the students in the college something of the reality of the challenge and response of daily responsible and responsive living.

That's why I'd like to call my fifth and final mediating challenge the educational program itself in Justin Morrill, our curriculum which we hope will be developmental. We read with great interest and sympathy men like Nevitt Sanford who challenge us to keep students moving toward greater emotional and intellectual maturity. We have tried to build a curriculum of experiences based on this notion or perhaps what Whitehead has called the "rhythms of education development," rather than one totally dedicated to disciplinary refinement. We have tried to mediate between the personal intellectual needs of the student and the intellectual requirements and goals of the University. In our formal curriculum on campus and off, we provide an unusually large spread of courses and experiences and then permit our students large amounts of freedom to choose among them. For example, this Fall we had something over forty different topics or courses on campus and off, in the field and in the classroom, in all the areas of social science, natural science and humanity -- from which students could choose. Each teacher from the university or from the college taught a course in his area of special interest, very similar to styles or curriculum growth in new universities.

We permit students to fashion, with the advice and counsel of their advisors, a program from among these. Choice itself, we feel, as well as freedom to make it, is rich with educational rewards: The more frequently you challenge students to fashion their own education, the more frequently you challenge faculty advisors to help students fashion an education, and the more often both actually enlist in the cause of their own self-culture. We wanted involved students in our community, not bench-bound listeners, so we opted for large amounts of freedom, recognizing the danger that freedom might as often confuse as liberate a person. Yet, if we define a person as one who has worked through to his uniqueness by the exercise of free choices, we cannot flinch from what Emerson called "the terrible freedom" within which a person makes his moves. Liberalizing education is a risky thing. It is not make-believe, although much schooling is.

To accomplish this liberalizing, we try to take full advantage of the entire campus and the world beyond. Ours is a college with a theme, "Cross-cultural Understanding and Service." We require all students to master a foreign language as a first step in encountering another major world culture. Then we offer him the chance to live in another culture overseas or off campus in this country. Over half the first two freshman classes have already gone into the field or overseas and we have only just launched this program. Our students have immersed themselves in non-classroom situations in Russia, Spain, France, Columbia, Mexico, Canada, Peru, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland, Morroco. Others have done field study in the migrant camps of Michigan, in Negro colleges in Louisiana, mental hospitals in Michigan, government offices and Upward Bound programs that we have run on our own campus. We are seeking to involve students in the world to learn something of the ways of the world, to enrich their response to the world and to themselves in the college setting, and to mediate between the student and his many worlds. We hope, if nothing else, to improve the quality of his questions. Our total program starts with an open-ended vision of what each student can become, seeks to define our special role in this interposition between him and his several worlds, and measures his educational progress developmentally and not solely in terms of his accumulated knowledge. We are very interested in developing his capacity to comprehend himself and the world with wisdom, discipline, and wonder.

What do we learn from all this storm and stress? We're only two years down the road, so you must put all of what I say in that context; most of it is still inevitably prophecy and not history. First, although there is no inevitable magic in educational shuffles, there are probably better ways for developing humane intelligence than we have yet clocked in the university world. We need to complement that world, for it is educationally incomplete. The creation of residential colleges in the university provides a rich diversity of administrative and curricular challenges that keeps students, faculty, and universities moving in their development. Diversity in itself is not necessarily progressive, any more than change in itself is. But it does build imbalance into the system, thus forcing those who are in it to see new equilibriums.

Residential colleges ought to present to the universities which create them parallel challenges to what they offer to students within them: the challenge to self-renewal. John Gardner has written in his book, Self Renewal, that we cannot go back to simpler days nor stem the pressure for intricate organization of our economy. We must, rather, master new forms of organization or they will master us. The most hopeful thing today, he writes, is that we seem to be achieving patterns of organization that avoid stultification, rigidity, and threats to freedom inherent in monolithic integrations. If this is true, he continues, it may be the most important single fact in our future. It is possible, he believes, to continue achieving economy of scale, e.g. large universities, and still give attention to human needs. "We must examine the conditions under which organization is a threat to the individual, i.e., the kinds of organizational patterns that are the greatest threat and the safeguards which can be built into organizations to minimize the threats. We can insist that one of the aims of any organization is the development of the individuals who make it up. We must learn to organize for freedom."

We are too young in Justin Morrill to judge how well or poorly we have served Michigan State for the students and faculty in our attempts to organize for freedom. But I would like to quote what one of our sophomore girls feels about our progress:

> This summer I worked in Chicago with a group of college students from all over the country, aggressive students who called themselves rebels and radicals and were resentful of educational spoon-feeding. They have grown past the stage of placidly accepting a bottle of warm milk to fill their academic needs or being fed by spoon or cup; they refuse much of the food offered them altogether. They spit out some of what they accept and they chew over the rest very carefully. But in spite of all their aggressive discontent and educational ideas and ideals, they seemed unable to alter their fundamentally passive approach to their own education.
>
> It was in contact and contrast with these students that my verbal awareness of Justin Morrill's accomplishments became meaningful to me. Some students and faculty members here are trying to approach education with a fundamentally different attitude, an attitude of active involvment. I don't think we realize how basic this difference is, partly because active involvement is so very easily confused with anti-passive

> involvement, which happens on any campus where students and professors try to improve their education either by trying to change existing structures or by withdrawing from them to work on their own. Just what makes our involvement different is hard to identify. Partly, it just the belief that we are different. It is students and faculty members working together to plan and create, and individual learners who create new courses or field studies or something completely untried. But mostly, I think, it is a way of looking at ourselves as being involved, not in a negative reaction against, but in a positive response for.

Now, lest you think we have only glittering success in Justin Morrill, let me complete this student's observation with her concluding sobering insight:

> To describe our most important problem, I would reverse my answer to question one. We are too spoon-fed, too uninvolved; our ideals are much too ideal, intellectual and abstract, rather than responses to the moment-by-moment educational process. The university is afraid that students who are not fed will get an improper diet, or even climb down from their highchairs before they finish their dinner. And to look at us, one would think we have the same fears. But I think our problem is inertia -- it's easier to feed a baby than to let him feed himself. It's easier to rely on old recipes than to try out new ones. It's easier to accept what is offered you than to create your own offerings. Not only is it easier, but it's expected and highly rewarding. Most of us most of the time operate as if this college were non-involving. Many of us operate this way all the time. Our challenge is to expect involvement from everyone in our community rather than express it as an ideal and feel pleased when it occasionally happens.

Before we leave this quote, I'd like to draw your attention to the key pronoun this girl used, the pronoun "we." It's hard to come up with a satisfactory litmus test for community, but I think this may be one. I call it "Justin Morrill's great pronoun shift." When we started two years ago, we heard constantly about the impersonal "they" who seemed to be running things. "They say that Justin Morrill is this . . .," "They have decided that. . ." "They've concluded that this policy was not right," and so on. "They" bore the burden of every academic and personal complaint. It's always been so and always will be when persons feel dwarfed within monolithic organizations. But now, two years into our enterprise, not always, but frequently -- in the Grill, along the corridors and in the dining rooms, during committee meetings, in my office, and in written criticisms -- I hear another pronoun, "we." With the unconscious emergence of the first person plural in our daily dialogue, I take heart that indeed we are developing a developmental learning style, that "we" together have caught the first glimmer of a hint of the idea that persons discover their humanity not in isolation, but in encounter with other persons and themselves.

But that's not the note I want to end on. So much remains to be done, as our student reminds me, to convert what might be into what is and ironically our greatest threat in this regard is our own brand of creeping traditionalism within the college, believe it or not. We feel this among both students and faculty. When we propose to change programs or practices, we sometimes hear, "We in Justin Morrill don't do it that way." Our two years worth of what is now sometimes blocks our thinking about what might be. We've for-gotten we should operate on the two clocks. But we need the courage to create continually. As the Provost reminded Madison College students this fall, "The temptation is to forget that you are experimenting and to qucikly defend what you are doing. What you do for yourselves and all of education depends on your inclination to evaluate constantly what you are doing, to observe the effect of it, and to reject the ineffective as determined by your long-range goals." Our greatest threat does not lie in hostile criticism from outside or within. It lies in contentment with "good enough." For not only does a "good enough" attitude blind you to present inadequacies, it removes you from the creative and mediating tensions of challenge and response. The danger is that because of the very American desire for a quick payoff, a good image, and the best possible light before the widest possible public, we of Justin Morrill at Michigan State will settle for too little.

Vince Lombardi of the Green Bay Packers believes his role as Coach is to be the First Believer; to win, the team must absorb the courage of his convictions. I think a dean of a developing college should also be the confidence man in the front office. But confidence is not enough. A dean of a developing college must be developing, too. So he must be the First Disbeliever, never content to let sleeping dogmas lie, learning (you haven't heard the worst yet!) always to live out on a limbo! He must learn how to mediate continually between the two realities, one of seeming fixity -- with institutions, dogmas, rules of punctuation and routines of the calendared and clockwise world of all but futile round on round -- and the other of whirling and flying electrons, dreams, and possibilities behind the clock.

Comments by Discussants

NEVITT SANFORD: I've been very much taken with Dean Rohman's way of getting things started at Justin Morrill College. He's been going in accord with the great American principle, "I'll start her up and see if she'll run." This has an additional advantage for Michigan State in that it has enabled them to keep ahead of the University of Michigan, which, as I understand it, is a special motivation in that part of the world!

Actually, he has followed here in the footsteps of the great John Dewey with the idea of continuous experimentation. Life itself is a matter of continuous experimentation. Many people point to the fact that the colleges founded in the Thirties which called themselves "experimental" have been ossified and now have their own traditions. Some of them deny this, saying that the characteristic thing about an experimental college is that it's continually experimental. In the case of a college like Antioch, for example, it's much easier to introduce a new curricular arrangement or new arrangement for teaching than at most other places because the Antioch tradition is one of continuous experimentation. In Dean Rohman's account of how Justin Morrill got started, he was very much aware of what the traffic at Michigan State would bear. He has very wisely known when to compromise. But this means that we must recognize that there are compromises here. We can only hope that he is going to continue to push in the direction of getting more traffic on to the faculty. Just having them come and teach whatever they're interested in from their disciplines and setting forth their specialties may not be the best way to do it.

That brings me to the second point, I would like to hear more about the culture of Justin Morrill College. Dean Rohman was coming to that when he spoke of the generation of the "we" feeling there. I want to emphasize the notion that the object of the residential college is to arrange things so that all of the feeding, emotional life, and loyalty of the students is in the interest of learning. The way to get away from the sort of thing the students were describing last night -- their vivid descriptions of how it is with students who sit passively in classrooms or who clearly separate what is happening in the classroom with what is happening in their lives -- is to somehow develop in the residential college those things that students are really interested in, the things they share with others. We want students to become acculturated, to become part and parcel of the major intellectual culture, the culture of learning that faculty believe they stand for.

Therefore, I think these colleges must deliberately try to create culture. Creating culture is not easy, but it does happen. We have seen youth groups, for example, create culture. In Santa Cruz when the students lived in trailers during the first year of life of that college, each trailer generated a little culture. They generated a language, their way of speaking of things. There were certain accepted patterns; normality consensus began to develop within each trailer. I would like to know what can be done at Justin Morrill College or any other college to generate this common culture, this set of shared beliefs, attitudes, and values which include above all, interest in the things of the mind. We should fix it so that people can't live comfortably in the college without being interested intellectually in something. This is a great thing about the old days at Harvard. There was only one way in which you could reproach a graduate student and that was to discover that he had no deep intellectual interest. Anybody who was interested in anything was in. Our goal is to fix it so that students who say "blah" with respect to everything that's being offered are looked down upon. Or to create a culture in which the style is to give visiting lecturers who come to the college to talk about their specialties a really challenging time. You could do this if you could create a situation in which the students are well-versed in criticism and the style is to criticize everybody, to frighten the guy who is coming in to talk about his specialty by asking him hard questions. If he comes in to talk and suggests that his specialty is the most important thing in the world, there are ways to upset his apple cart by asking what makes him think this is so important, or what does this have to do with solving this or that terrible problem that we confront in our society.

I want to suggest in this same connection what we can do with respect to rules and regulations. What you do really depends on what sort of problems there are. In one section of the country, you can have rules about drinking that you couldn't have in another. When drinking on the campus was finally permitted at Stanford, it was nothing more than bringing the rules into line with the culture that already existed. In North Carolina I dare say the problem would be quite different. As a general rule, liberalization in the area of sex relations in our society is harder to bring about than liberalization in the area of alcoholic beverage control. In a state that still has "brown bag" laws about alcohol, you have to take it easy in the general area of liberalizing rules about sex. This is not to say that you don't need a clear conception of the direction in which you want to change the culture.

I was also very much taken with Dean Rohman's conception of the two clocks and two worlds. The second clock, the world of the imagination, is for me the world where we really live if we have been educated. This is the world of endless expansiveness where we can satisfy more human needs than we can in any kind of social situation. The real world of the student is the world of his mind. What we must emphasize is what happens when a student gets involved with ideas and what we can do to encourage this state of affairs. There's still plenty of need for criticism in existing institutions. A perfectly good strategy would be to keep on criticizing, because it's impossible to overestimate the inadequacy of many of the things that are still done in our best universities.

To get back to the question of involvement with ideas. What is really involved here? For one thing, love is involved. When we say that we "love Cahucer," or, "I love that course," what is involved is the same kind of love that's involved in addiction to tobacco or the love of another person or the love of one's own car. This emotional attachment to an idea or book is of the same quality as our emotional attachment to anything else. A person who doesn't have this kind of love is enormously hindered. As you think of the difference between a person who can love only things like cars or clothes, think how limiting, how expensive it is if he is going to have a really active love life as compared with the person whose love is of ideas and what can be found in books. The latter is never at a loss for a bit of romance, and the infinite variety of this for the really educated person is a large part of his life. So we must get students hooked on books. Granted, there are a lot of other pleasures that students enjoy which we, alas, are not able to so much. Yet we must do everything we can to help them enjoy this kind of thing which means so much to us. To show you what I mean, it is very interesting to note that most of us who have become hooked on books probably had the experience of reading illicit literature, meaning that we were finding in literature some sort of expression of all sorts of forbidden desires. What better way to gratify forbidden desires than by reading books? Very inexpensive and untroublesome; it doesn't damage anybody else, and it's wonderfully gratifying.

Another thing that happens to the student when he becomes involved is that he becomes identified with his work. The professor who can't talk about anything but his specialty really has something, i.e. a specialty which for all practical purposes is a part of his personality. Attack his specialty and you attack him, he is so closely identified with it. Students become capable of this as soon as they do some work of their own. If a student is given the opportunity to write a paper about something he cares about (and unless students write papers under these conditions, it's better that they not write at all) he becomes involved in it and it's his paper. Our criticism of it is very different from criticism dashed off routinely in order to meet a deadline. But we will never get this kind of involvement in learning unless we can create situations in which students actively do something themselves, in which they display what they can do and are identified with it. This means that in these residential colleges, we must alter the whole structure of teaching enough so that each student has the experience of doing some work with which he is identified and receiving criticism which he takes very seriously. I would exchange a lot of ordinary straight courses for one course or arrangement in which a student has this experience.

This leads to a general comment about content. The point was made here that there is no one content, that the same objectives can be achieved by means of a variety of contents. Every college admits this by allowing electives or by agreeing that this or that program will do the same thing. If you take this seriously, then you're saying in effect that it's not the content, but the kind of experience that a student has which matters. Then we're really quite free to think about curricular change. In thinking of the residential college as something that complements the rest of the university, I want to come back to the curriculum. We should introduce some curriculum that stand in contrast to usual university curriculum. In talking about a multidisciplinary curriculum or a problem-oriented curriculum, I don't mean just to be different or to seek new ways to challenge students. I mean that the university structure of departments and disciplines is out of date and inadequate to the problems of our time. Most structures of departments and schools started as a result of all kinds of historical accidents and then just grew, perpetuated because of the interest vested in them. But it seems ridiculous to say that such structures are the way to organize the search for knowledge today. To confirm this, one only has to recognize that the university structure of departments has done practically nothing about the great problems that confront us as a society. It's not only that disciplines deliberately avoid any true involvement with real problems, but they can't become involved with real problems because such problems are not defined in disciplinary terms. Most problems don't recognize disciplines. They just exist, and the kind of inquiry that is adequate for them must be a different kind than that represented in the university today.

When speaking about curricular change, I'm talking about the hardest thing of all; namely, shaking up the graduate schools. I'm suggesting that they are missing out in major areas of inquiry to which they should be devoting themselves. One way to combat this would be to organize a curriculum for freshmen in the residential college around problems, inquiry into problems without regard to any disciplines at all. Disciplinary men could contribute something, of course, if they thought their discipline really has something to do with life or with the real world. But they would have to show that this is indeed the case or else the culture of this college, the critical students there, would give them a difficult time.

When we introduce a young faculty member into the residential college, we should consider that his development is as much our task as that of developing students. We should create a climate in which it is understood that he is there not merely to exhibit what he already knows and is, but to learn something and to develop just like the rest of us. If he doesn't use this opportunity to try some things he would like to try over in his department but hasn't been permitted or dared to, then I think we are missing a bet. When we come to this terrible question of how to interest faculty in educational reform or how to interest them in students, we have to begin by liberating the faculty. I've said once that we have first to make the faculty happy, but that didn't get very far because most people think that the faculty is not supposed to be happy, that education is essentially grim, and that it won't do for the faculty to be happy. I don't mean slap-happy, but feeling purposeful and imbued with the belief that they are getting some place, a sense of movement, and enjoyment of life. The thing that strikes me is the unhappiness and grimness you find among college and university faculty, their meanness to themselves, to each other, and their generalized meanness. This means that they have to be liberated. In other words, faculty can't possibly be interested in students or give anything to them as long as they're preoccupied with their own frustrations.

I think the curriculum of experience is great and I would underline that we must learn to use all the experiences that students normally have in residential colleges for educational purposes. It isn't always necessary to generate new experiences. Students are already having many experiences; for example, the experience of struggling with the deans for more liberty. This can be wonderfully educational in learning how people win liberty. There are good ways and ineffective ways to do it, ways to do it which sacrifice other values and ways which make for gains all around. Any struggle of this sort should be brought right into the classroom and put in a general context of ideas about freedom and authority and who is going to have what kind of power. This is really a topic for political scientists, the old question of what kind of social organization we are to have and how power used to be distributed and so on. Such a consideration would be another way of integrating learning and life.

DANA FARNSWORTH: The comment about specialists who insisted on talking about their own subject reminded me of Mark Van Doren's article in Harper's Magazine back about 1930. He was at a dinner party and the sweet young thing sitting by him would talk about anything. But the trouble was, he said, that she wouldn't talk about anything else. This is the problem so often in the dialogue between faculty and students. They get hung up on unimportant points and avoid coming to grips with some of the real problems.

Although I agree that in a sense there is no one way, no one constant in education, there is something in common in all these attempts to develop a residential college which is complementary or supplementary to the university. What we are really trying to do is to transmit enthusiasm for learning and to teach a method of becoming educationally self-propelled. The dean of the Business School used to say that the first task of the Harvard School of Business Administration is to destroy the sense of certainty in the new students and then teach them to make decisions in the face of constantly changing, insufficient facts. A student gets pretty confused after a while with all of this and yet still has to stay afloat.

One way many universities get around the shortcomings of departmentalism is by developing centers for interdisciplinary studies, e.g. centers for Chinese studies, population studies, international legal studies, Middle Eastern studies, communicable disease centers, etc. But as soon as they get well established, they develop their own hierarchy. Then they're burdened with two different kinds of administrative overloads.

What we're really trying to define here is the kind of education which takes competence for granted. None of us -- whether we come at it through psychiatry, sociology, education or whatever -- downgrades competence. We're also trying to develop and help people retain curiosity. And we're trying to develop motivation, a consistent kind of self-discipline, in which one is always correcting himself as he goes along. We'd also like to develop a sense of exhilaration from accomplishment that comes from within the self. Some components of this can be termed enjoyment, others enthusiasm. In short, we're trying to develop essential responsibility to self and to society. Going back to our Harvard Student Studies, this is one thing that seems to be about as strong as any of the influences that apply to the Harvard student.

He can hardly escape the pressure to be something worthwhile to somebody besides himself, to move out to others, to have a sense of public service. If this were cultivated explicitly, I don't think it would be very effective. It must be done implicitly, indirectly. The reward that comes from this cannot come only from the outside, although it includes peer group approval. It should come from an altered self-esteem. It includes the enjoyment of acquiring knowledge and the meaning of that knowledge for its own sake.

As to the conflict between authority and freedom, my favorite thought comes from Judge Learned Hand, who said, "A society which sets about achieving freedom for everyone ends with freedom only for the savage few." Or in terms of the law school citation, the President gives the Harvard students thier Ll.B.'s "for three years of study of the wise restraints that make men free." In a residential college, the matter of conflict between authority and freedom is crucial. Where there is so much emphasis on the rights of the individual that the rights of everyone else are being whittled away, the time has come for us to put more emphasis on the restraints that will enable us to keep these freedoms we have. This can come about in large measure through the development of the kind of education that residential colleges make possible.

Group Discussion

GORDON ROHMAN (in response to a question about the benefits to faculty in teaching in Justin Morrill, his role in determining promotions, and the willingness of departments to make their faculty available to Justin Morrill): It's probably premature to give more than a subjective answer to the question on what effects we have had on the faculty. I don't have a correspondingly apt quotation as I did from our student to testify to our effectiveness with faculty members. Our success there has been uneven, partly because of our own fault, and because their tenure in college was so brief as to have argued against any significant effect. We need more exposure to what Dr. Sanford has called "culture" so that they pick up something of our style and hopefully make it their own. It may also be that in those few who have given me their personal testimonies, I see a new role for teachers. It may be that these are the people who are well on the way to doing this in their departments, so they volunteered to come to our setting and confirmed what one had predicted. Perhaps social scientists could instruct me as to how we could get a hold of this by reports or questionaires, or by actual courses offered differently in the departments as the result of faculty experience in the college. I expect all of this is a little premature. Of necessity, we have primarily concentrated upon creating the culture, the style within the college, and we have some assurance that students have picked this up from us. There is no question that the people who are in the college full time, core faculty, who give courses unique to their setting, have developed a new awareness of greater possibilities. For example, we have a whole new sociology program for this fall developed around a learning team concept which brings in outside consultants, laymen, students involved in teaching. This is a whole new arena for learning being developed within the sociology component of our curriculum, and there is a major change among the faculty who have done this.

I don't quite know how to answer your question about the effect we have on departments. I suspect we have some, although I think it's too early to determine this.

In securing faculty, I follow normal bureaucratic procedure to the top and work down. E.g., I go to the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and review my needs for faculty next year in the areas of humanities. He in turn gives me clearance to talk to each of the department chairmen, and I negotiate directly with them and with the men involved. Unofficially, of course, I learn about the men I want and make informal contacts, finding out whether they are interested and appropriate before getting back on the official track. Technically, I make positions available to departments to fill.

One of the facts of our existance that is crucial is that we are separately budgeted, like any other college. Since I control the budget, I can give to the Department of English a full-time position if I want the equivalent of a full-time teacher of English in the college. It may be one man or it may be three pieces of faculty. This allows the department to hire a replacement; in effect, adding a position to their department. In exchange for this, I get some selection from among available faculty. Usually this negotiation is amicable, i.e., I end up with the people who are appropriate for our operation and who the department chairman is willing to surrender to me for a portion of time. We have had departments where we have run into opposition. The chairman will not cooperate and so that ends negotiations. But more frequently than not there has been not only official cooperation pledged but actual cooperation given by the deans and department chairmen. I do not kid myself that this is based entirely upon altruism. In the past couple of years, we have enjoyed a fairly affluent relationship with the legislature. This year this is not true. We vary in our fortunes with the politics of the State Capital, and as the resources get lean, tempers get short and jealousy about preferment rises, etc. Thus far, we seem more frequently than not to get people in the areas in which we want them, people we think are valuable for our circumstance.

It is also a sort of inspired guess whether this will continue. We're speculating now with a pattern which would give total control of a course to a person who comes in to teach part time. We probably ought more frequently to call our shots within the college, getting our policy concerns on the agenda, and then bringing in people on a consultant basis rather than as full-time faculty to serve our needs in the arena of our concern on policy problems. However, we are blocked at the moment by lack of bugetary flexibility in the Office of Business and Finance so that we can pay a man for two hours or eight hours of lecturing. At present we have to pay him for a major portion of his time or none at all. Now, that's merely a practical problem. We are now in the process of negotiating a greater flexibility in the use of faculty so that their time with us is more efficient, so that we get only the fruit and flower of a man we want in the college, and so that he also does not have to make an excessive commitment that not only prejudices his performance in the college but also irritates the chairman. That's the knife-edge of our negotiations right now. With time and effort that will be gradually changed. But there has been an amazing amount of good will not only pledged, but given, from the top down and from the bottom up.

D. GORDON ROHMAN (in response to questions about the distinctiveness of courses taught in the college, the kind of concentration available there, and the different styles available in the different residential colleges at Michigan State University): Yes, indeed, we do provisionally have a distinctive pattern. We ask a student to take a range of courses in the various disciplines of natural science, social science, and humanity. For example, as we count them, we get five disciplines in humanities and five in social sciences. We ask them to take four of the five in each, so there is a pattern established. But a student need not take any particular course in any of the disciplines and the courses vary as the teachers and the topics vary. This does impose a pattern within which there are significant amounts of freedom both on the part of the teacher to teach and the student to elect to take particular courses. That is the pattern in humanities and social science. Our natural science is a minor variation on that. We have a single required year-long basic course in natural science because of what the natural scientists consider the prerequisite nature of knowledge in these areas. This is followed by two options of courses in wide open areas of studies in international science, issues in science, etc., which are more on the other pattern, i.e., teachers employed to give topics of their special interest which students are allowed to elect. Even there, there's a great deal of freedom of response on both sides. In addition, there are courses in social science, the humanities, natural science, field study and overseas study. In the English composition program in the first year that we call "Inquire and Expression," we have the entire freshman class assembled for lectures on topics of international concern. This fall for example, the topic is "War and Peace." In the winter semester we are going to talk about "Coming of Age." The entire class breaks up into seven-man seminars with a writing coach, as we call him, for discussion of the writing produced by students on the topics in the course. That's another pattern.

There is also a senior seminar required of all students which is our capstone experience, a synthesizing and integrating experience at the end of their course. These take up about two-thirds of the total 180 credits required for graduation at Michigan State. We're on a quarter system. In the balance of his time, we require a student to take a field of concentration in courses in the University. It may be simply a major as described in the catalog. Or it may be some variation approved by his advisor in the college. We have the freedom both for a traditional major or for some variation that makes sense as a student negotiates with his advisor and the departments. A student may end up in Justin Morrill with the equivalent of a major in psychology, history, English, or mathematics. He may also end up with an inter-disciplinary major either in an accepted combination or in one of our combinations which he has been able to convince somebody makes intellectual sense for him and for his future. There's still time left in this scheme for electives taken in the University, so a student gets a chance to explore a little more. Thus there is a changeable pattern, but a pattern that has both freedom and authority build into it. It has certain general schemes to take a serious engagement with and also a freedom of response within them. A student may graduate with a bachelor of arts degree in something as specific as history or as general as the humanities, or something that indeed braces the two.

The two new colleges that have come along have chosen other forms of response to the open question of the nature of a residential college. They decided to call the second one Lyman Briggs College, and it is primarily for students interested in natural science. The third college, James Madison, is organized primarily for social science, and integrated around the study of policy problems. I look with interest on their patterns and with thankfulness that there are now three where before there was only one to speak for the cause of residential college education. However, neither of them are "my cup of tea." I don't think that slicing the pie on more traditional disciplinary boundaries is particularly imaginative. What it seems to do is simply to fall into rather departmentalized areas of study. I like our notion better, a cross-cultural theme which can be anything. It's a big enough tent, in other words, so we can do about what we please. This is why I'm interested in an attempt to develop this sort of philosophy of the inter-position where we try to create a culture, a style of response to all fields of learning, using a cross-cultural theme not as an end but as a means to liberalization.

The other difficulty I forsee with the creation of two new colleges is that in the process of defining the categories into which most people fall, if there are colleges of natural and social science, that means we are obviously the arts college. This kind of stereo-typical response is going to be fatal to our self-conception and the conception of students and faculty. Also, this plays into the hands of critics who want no more residential colleges. They can easily take the position that now we've "covered the waterfront." With all three major areas of college -- natural science, social science, and humanities -- you don't need to go any farther or create any more colleges. Thus this can be used as an argument for ending the development of colleges.

And finally to your last question: What do I envision as the possibilities of a prolifiration of colleges? I don't want to see another Justin Morrill at Michigan State. I certainly don't want to see another Madison or Briggs. However, I would like to see other forms of style or culture building which fill the gaps in present patterns of university learning. Whether they are to be filled with something we call residential colleges is not the basic issue since I assume residential colleges are a means to an end of increasing the efficiency of educational organization. I think it is primarily an organizational problem. At Michigan State we have a problem of scale. There are 40,000 students on the East Lansing Campus alone. Eighteen to twenty thousand live in residence houses, dormitories on the campus, giving us the largest on-campus population in the United States. How do we handle them? We have in existence the so-called "living-learning dormitories" which were built beginning in 1959, with built-in classrooms and faculty offices which are used as locations for existing academic programs. They are in essence sub-systems of existing programs, simply offered in new locations on campus. I don't think that fills the gap, creates the culture, or increases the efficiency of the learning that's done. It simply transports traditional patterns of learning to other parts of the campus. I would like to see other, more imaginative responses. Is it impossible to conceive an entire university undergraduate curriculum organized in collegiate settings? We have to organize it somehow. Why settle for the rather discredited commuter forms of organizations? We don't operate in a vacuum. The vacuum is filled one way or the other. We have currently filled it one way. Why not initiate a more educational filling of that vacuum in residential style culture building? This idea is far away for Michigan State and I would be misrepresenting the situation there if I said that there are presently on the planning board thirty-two more colleges. There are no more in the planning that I know of, rather, we are going through something of a crisis as people ask us to prove ourselves in categories never made clear. If we have to prove ourselves in departmental categories, then we're dead by definition since we're not defending departmental virtues. Instead, we're trying to define something that has not yet existed on campus. We are existing in what I characterize as the gap. I cannot reason theoretically (although I can conjure up a thousand practical reasons) why such colleges are impossible of enactment tomorrow.

PANEL DISCUSSION

Jed Dietz, Glen Elder, Daniel Pattersonn

CHAIRMAN CLIFFORD B. REIFLER: The encouraging thing is that all the past is but prelude. We hope that this conference is just a start. If anyone was expecting particular answers, we certainly don't have the answers. At this point, I'm not sure whether we have the pertinent questions. But this is what this conference has been all about. Even Dean Rohman, who gave us an answer for a particular college within a particular university at a particular time, raised questions about how the rest of us should proceed. But proceed we must, for even deciding to do nothing is making a decision about how things will proceed.

I believe it was Oliver Wendell Holmes who said, "A mind stretched by a new idea can no longer retain its former shape." At this point, my mind is somewhat shapeless. I hope the discussion which this generates on this campus and other campusses will serve to raise areas of inquiry and point directions which each of the institutions may take. I don't think any one answer can be right more than a portion of a time for a portion of the people.

Professional students particularly, and undergraduates as well, have two questions which they ask of themselves and of the faculty as they proceed through their education. One is, "What's important?" and the other, "How am I doing?" The residential college concept can provide some of the beginning answers to these questions so that students can not only know what's important, but start dealing with it; not only know how they are doing, but go about doing it. We have labeled this a summary panel discussion. I anticipate it won't be as much a summary of what has happened as an exploration of the question, "Where do we go from here?"

JED DEITZ: I want to tell a story about a favorite person of mine, Winston Churchill. He was at a party one night and walked up to a countess and said,"Madame, you're ugly." She replied, "Sir Winston, you're drunk!" And he said, "Ah, yes, madame, but tomorrow, I'll be sober." I've listened to the talks in this twenty four-hour period. Signposts have jumped up in my mind, but like those little Burma Shave signposts, not always the first one rings truest or makes me think most. The one that hit me most last night was the one posted by Dr. Anne Scott, "How can we challenge the student?" If it were asked in search of a stimulant which would activate student minds to question themselves, I have no quarrel. But if it was asked in the hope of delineating a formula which might be applied to students, then I object. One of the basic questions, one of the basic obstacles to thought, is that the questions are already formed by most university communities.

Last night, Dr. Sanford said that by challenge, he did not mean that a faculty member would present to a student each day a set of challenges. And I noticed that there was some very comfortable laughter after that. "Here, take this test." "See if you can get this A." "Write this term paper."

√

"Learn French because you need it to be educated." I find myself so busy responding to these almost daily challenges that I have little time to wonder why I'm here or why higher education even exists as it does in this country. I see a lack of questioning on the part of the authoritarian section of our campuses as the best stimulus of student questioning. The result is thought, something so lacking in our nation today. I had the pleasure of listening to Carl Davison, the President of SDS this past summer. He did two very funny things. He started off by lambasting President Johnson for quoting the dogmas of the 1930's and then he ended up by quoting the dogmas of 1961 and 1962 that Carl Oglesby has written. If that radical group has fallen into the trap of not questioning or reevaluating itself, it will be easy for us to do that, too. Perhaps an obvious question is why we want to stimulate thought. The first answer is that it is in itself educational. The second answer in the context of this conference is that this is most what the residence colleges need. I was greatly appreciative of Dean Rohman's remarks because I heard him say that Justin Morrill College's problems were not my problems, and that obviously his solutions were not mine, either. He warned against jumping too quickly on the bandwagon. We must confront the campuses individually and courageously. When this conference ends, who is going to lead the fight to get money from foundations so that economic limitations imposed by the State can be circumvented? Who is going to move that these conferences continue on the individual campuses, focusing on their special needs? Who is going to be talking about co-ed residence colleges? Who is going to re-think for Chapel Hill or East Lansing, or Amherst, Massachusetts, the residential college system as it now exists on those campuses? And when these questions are asked and answered, who will draw up some new questions to start the process all over again?

I see the residence colleges as a stimulating self-challenge -- not because they are aesthetically more pleasant or because they're going to contain faculty members or because they will have their own curriculum or for any of the gimmicky reasons about which we have been talking in the last twenty-four hours. They will stimulate thought because they, like all good political issues, hit the constituent in the most sensitive part of his existence, how he lives. Rather than complain that society has created people who are concerned about life styles, we should capitalize on that and through experimenting with the life styles, stimulate self-evaluation. The residence college might suggest to the student that he is a citizen who can be heard. There must be some encouragement of that on your part.

I am concerned about the smugness which inevitably follows such exciting sessions as the one we are about to finish. I want to point as an example to how little we sometimes see. In the speech that Parker Hudson gave last night, the problem he was delineating was not a new one. But it's incredible that we haven't seen it sooner. Where have we been when the bored faces have been looking at us over lecterns. And where have the students been when we've been surrounded by the bored faces and have contributed to them ourselves? Does it take that kind of articulation to make us face a problem? Or are we going from this conference dedicated not only to strengthening residence colleges but to strengthening our own self-evaluation and our own challenge? I hope I'm not being too mean, or cynical, or skeptical, but I have a great fear about us waking up tomorrow sober, and the residence colleges still being ugly. And then we move on to another conference. I just don't want that to happen.

GLENN ELDER: My major objective tonight is to emphasize a point that hasn't received much emphasis in this twenty-four hour period, and that is the relationship between the residential college and the off-campus environment or, you might say, the larger society. This could apply to the relationship between the university and the community in which it finds itself. I want to focus particularly on the way in which this relationship can improve the developmental benefits achieved by students in the residential college environment. Opening up the college environment to the non-student world involves the creation of situations in which students, faculty, and adults of all ages can interact around problems of common concern, settings in which meaningful dialogue and listening can occur between old and young, men and women, in which the problem at hand is challenging and not trite. Such problem-centered activity and learning, whether dealing with poverty in the community or tutoring young children, are likely to generate responsible lines of action for those involved and provide bridges of respect and understanding between social groups that often do not normally interact. I have in mind particularly the relationship between adults and youth.

During the past ten years, we have seen a striking change on the college campus which I think is very significant. That is the movement from student encapsulation on the campus to student engagement in the larger community in concerns that involve all of us in this country and as citizens of this world. The Civil Rights movement rediscovered the needs of impoverished families and represents a major impetus in this development. Also involved is the desire to tackle meaningful and challenging tasks and to assert some control over the forces that influence the student. As an example, look at some of the changes in the roles of student leaders on college campuses. My primary reference is Berkeley because I've spent the last six years there. This past year at Berkeley, the student government voted sizeable reductions in the budget for such activities as the marching band and cheerleaders, and allocated this money to the student tutorial program. In this rather remarkable program, at least 2,000 Berkeley students are volunteering their time, effort, and energy at great sacrifice, to work with children in the slums of Oakland and Berkeley. Here the student government is responding to this need by putting its money where its mouth has been in the past six or seven years, through all the activity which has received such publicity and given the university a bad name. Unfortunately, the positive activities have not received adequate description or publicity across the country.

What about the forces which resist such inner-penetration of the campus and society, and the inter-relationship between these two, the community and the campus? Certainly, we should include fears of criticizing the campus, the political repercussion in the state. The point I would like to emphasize here is the age segregation and its unfortunate contribution to distrust between age groups. We find considerable resistance on and off campus to the mixing of age groups, even when students and adults work together on a task of mutual interest. The manifestations of age segregation are especially pronounced in California where segregated communities of the aged are developing at a rapid rate, and there is a pronounced separation of old and young in churches, schools, and clubs. Only recently have we even begun to look at the consequences of segregating the young and the old, separating adults from adolescents. I think our schools are perhaps the most unfortunate example of rigid age grading.

The consequences of age segregation are much the same as other forms of social segregation, e.g. social distance, resentment, hostility, and distrust. It also produces reinforcement of negative stereotypes, restricted social learning where the young cannot learn from the old and the old cannot learn from the young, pronounced discontinuities between age groups, and inadequate preparation for movement from one age status to another.

Many of the benefits resulting from a living-learning environment composed of students, faculty, and adults have already been noted in past speeches. I would like to underscore several of these. One is the development of friendships between age groups characterized by mutual understanding and trust. Another is reciprocal assistance in modeling and interpersonal, academic, and vocational areas. If you separate age groups, where are the members of a young age group going to learn what comes next in the experience?

I'd like to close with just a few programs that might implement this idea of how involvement in the community could be implemented in the residential college. First might be the establishment of special projects in the community. At Berkeley, we set up a transitional house for boys coming out of the California Youth Authority and moving back into the community to assist them in their re-integration process. In the formation of this house, the group involved students, faculty, and townspeople. The majority of the individuals working in the house were students. This provided an unusual opportunity for these three groups to learn from each other and to grow from their experiences in working and providing a home environment for juvenile offenders.

Another program might be bringing in adults from particular occupations who would live in a residential college for a week or less, e.g. Yale's program of Chubb Fellows. This kind of interaction with an adult who has been through the ropes in an occupation and has special experience that he can bring to bear on problems that students are faced with, can add a vital element to their educational experience. In some ways, professors in the classrooms have abdicated their responsibility to provide dialogue on the vital issues that concern students, such as marriage, careers, life's meaning, and one's role in the world. Perhaps through this sort of experience, bringing in non-academic adults, we might supplement this kind of dialogue.

Thirdly, we could open up the residential college to members of the community and have them join with students and faculty in seminars or formal discussion. On a limited basis, it would be ideal if we could somehow recreate the one-room schoolhouse and have everyone involved in this sort of operation. I am arguing for this sort of thing in the secondary and primary schools, and we are getting this, in fact, as we ungrade our grades in the elementary school. Excellent outcomes are being realized from this sort of thing, as the older students take responsibility for guiding and instructing the young. They might have such responsibilities at home in rearing and taking care of their brothers and sisters, but here they have it in school and the young gain greatly from their exposure to older exemplars. The residential college provides an ideal setting for marshalling forces for bringing people together and providing an intimate setting, broadening the education of students who have too often been separated from this community.

DANIEL PATTERSON: One of my favorite Chapel Hill stories is about a barber who was famous for his inspired if unconscious commentaries on the events of the town. He was asked once which of the various presidents of the University that he had heard speak at commencement was the greatest orator. He thought for a moment, and said, "Well, it must have been President Battle because that man could designate, expostulate, and prevaricate like all the vast writers of antiquity." I think that our guests' comments, both formal and informal, have been provocative and suggestive and well worth the long and tiresome journies they made to come here and help us.

In the formal speeches and addresses made here, the responses in the discussion sessions, and in individual conversations, it seems to me that there have been several regions of anxiety. One is the fear that in constructing residential college curricula and other such programs, we might be manipulating students. Another sort of uneasiness that we heard expressed from time to time was concern with problem-solving as the goal of education. We heard this described as technique, feeling that the problems worth knowing should receive the central focus, that substance is acutely important. I don't really think that the uneasiness that some members were suggesting is unshared by the panelists who were speaking. In other words, I think the speakers were directing our attention to the kinds of premises that underlie the establishment of residential colleges, premises we all probably share. All have been concerned with new techniques, innovations, and the kinds of substance that have been characteristic of the traditional program.

At this point in the conference, I would still like to urge a bit of practical commentary on specific problems, for we have men here who have dealt with specific problems and can give us hints about small devices which they found exciting, useful, or unsuccessful. We face so many concrete and sometimes frustrating problems in our particular situation. We've got a campus of 15,000 students, with dormitory skyscrapers that will be difficult to convert to residential colleges. Certainly we cannot convert them to ideal housing or residental colleges. We have dining halls and dormitories located in the wrong places; men's halls distant from women, and so on. I'd like to hear a bit more commentary on specific answers to some of these problems.

One of our problems is how to stimulate the interest of students by means of curricular changes or other experimentations, exciting greater intellectual activity. If we are going to get any sort of sense of style in particular residential colleges, what are the means by which we can achieve this? Can anybody suggest particular things that may work, extracurricular devices for giving a sense of identity or giving a sense of excitement within the house? The ways of selecting students for these houses are important. Are they selected to enter these houses indiscriminately in the freshman year, or is there a trial period at some universities, after which the students know more about the campus and can select their own residential college? What about the student government or other organizations within the residential college? We've been talking here mostly about what faculty and administrators would do. What about the students themselves? What possible alternative structures are there within those houses in terms of curriculum? One of the most interesting things I heard this afternoon was Dean Rohman's explanation of the particular device used at Justin Morrill College for intensive language training as part of the residential college structure. Are there other such programs that might be interesting and might stimulate us? I know that the speakers will feel uneasy with this since they have specifically avoided trying to prescribe for our individual problems. Specific examples, however, will not necessarily be seen by us as solutions to our problems, but may stimulate us to find analogous things or parts of their ideas that would work for us.

Comments by Discussants:

NEVITT SANFORD: My impression is that this has been a very good conference. Ten years ago you couldn't have had this kind of discussion among faculty or educators, and it would have been almost unthinkable to have had students taking part as full members of the conference. But this is true everywhere now and it seems the most natural thing in the world in many places to have student participation in discussions of deep educational issues. That should be said to Jed Dietz to prevent him from being too pessimistic or too over-optimistic. I'm sure that we can appreciate his feeling that he wants to get on with it, and he has a right to feel that things may go more slowly than he has the right to hope. And I hate to say that this is a youth and age problem. It isn't just that, for I have the same problem as Mr. Dietz, that is, I am constantly on the over-optimistic side and have great trouble avoiding the disillusionment that comes when I confront my stubborn colleagues.

But it is worth noting that the winds of change are definitely blowing now, and the changes that Dean Rohman, Dana Farnsworth, and I have seen just in the last few years are really extraordinary. When we published The American College in 1962, we had a big conference of educators at Vassar to discuss the book, and it was almost impossible to discuss it. The whole conference got divided between those who are interested in students and those who are interested in academic qualities, or something like that. We could hardly communicate because of the amount of passion that got generated. We have the same issues before us now, but we can at least discuss them. Furthermore, the kinds of changes that have occurred in respect to this very business of the residential college are rather extraordinary, for this only goes back to the middle '50's. I think the first college of the sort that we've been talking about here was actually set up at the University of the Pacific. Raymond College was set up very much on the model of an Oxford College. They used the device of actually bringing into this college in Stockton, California, many of the ways of a true Oxford College, e.g. high tables, commons rooms, etc. Visiting firemen were invited to sit at the high table and go through this ritual, for they were actually trying to preserve some of this. It was not foolish, because they had the feeling that they wanted to build the identity of this college by deliberately building the culture around it and there is something to be said for that.

I would also say to Mr. Dietz and the students who want to get on with this that while they're trying to get change right now, they also build for the future, which means training the freshmen to carry on as students of education and reformers. It would be very sad if the young men and women that are now seniors should depart and leave no heirs in the form of students whom they have trained and inspired to carry on. As in any other political movement, you've got to have this kind of continuity and depth in this movement. I suppose that the general procedure for getting the kind of change that is desired is to work with individual faculty members. There are lots of them around who have enough guilt feelings so that it might not be difficult to get them involved in this. The time will come when there will be a solid movement of professors who are willing to teach quite differently in one of these residential colleges. Then I would say to the administration and faculty that this student interest in their own education and in educational reform is with us to stay and it is going to expand. I regard this as quite inevitable. It spreads very rapidly throughout the national student community, and once it is informed by knowledge of education, there is no turning back. That is what is happening and it is enormously significant. Students read the educational literature, and frequently in debates in the Stanford Daily about education, the students win hands down because they know what they're talking about; whereas most faculty have never had occasion to give much thought to the general problem of education. So an increasingly well-informed student group is bound to be with us, and I would suggest to deans and faculty that they listen to these students, particularly to those students who are interested in reform. Because if they don't, the students who are not interested in reform but in revolution or in some kind of destructiveness will become the student leaders. I think it's absolutely inevitable that we appeal to the student who is fighting some personal battle in this arena, for his appeal to the other students is very strong. So if you've got students who are willing to talk sense, and only want administrators and faculty members who will listem to them and engage in dialogue about education, you are well off. These are the students who must be worked with; otherwise, there will be more difficult students by far who will move into positions of leadership.

I thought what Dr. Elder said about the generations was just great. I was reminded of one of Joe Tussman's remarks. In writing about his experimental college and about youth, he spoke of all these generations that we've had, e.g. the passive generation, the beat generation, the hip generation, articulate generation, etc. He referred to this current generation of students as the "generation generation." They seem to know nothing except their own generation, and have so long associated only with their peers that the generation problem seems central in their lives. I'm very much taken with Dr. Elder's notion about lowering the boundaries between the inside and the outside of the university and I'm reminded of a special device carried out by Sir Eric Ashby. He reports that at Oxford they carried on in the great teaching tradition of the British university colleges even though the distinguished faculty were increasingly preoccupied with their research, by simply co-opting everybody in the neighborhood as teachers. Faculty wives, retired members of the faculty, unwary Americans who were visiting in the neighborhood, and people who worked in Oxford or Cambridge were brought in to do a little teaching. If you agree that teaching is not just a matter of dishing out information, but a relationship in which teacher and student work together at something, you can use a whole range of teachers.

DANA FARNSWORTH: I've always been impressed by Oliver Wendell Holmes' observation that a man who does not share in the perils and passions of his time may well later accuse himself of not having lived. I'm a little concerned about the large number of our youngsters today who have adopted the kind of protest on which they cannot look back with any pride whatsoever. We cannot accuse them of lack of courage or energy, or good intentions in many instances. The difficulty is how to get these people to engage in the kind of protest which is constructive. A good many of the things which Mr. Dietz talked about involve changes which could wake a great many students out of their apathy. The problem is that we have a few students, the "exaggerated generation" Clark Kerr talked about, who create antagonism that keeps them from getting their goals accomplished, and then the majority of students who aren't challenged at all. If we could start the kind of program through which the exaggerated group could channel their energies and the others could get excited, then maybe we could do something which would ease your feeling that this is just one more conference. We need substitutes in our society for poverty, ignorance, war, and disease, as means of demonstrating courage or as means of controlling the population. We have the greatest opportunity right now in the country to do something worthwhile than we have ever had. We have conquered the great majority of the evnironmental hazards; we have conquered economic want for three-fourths of our people, perhaps, but we haven't for the other quarter, and we are now getting to the stage where we're getting the disadvantages of affluence. Moving into a stage where we are emphasizing manipulation and power plays, we're getting down to where our rigidities are beginning to show up, where our selfishness becomes apparent. So we need an approach to minimizing the poverty that is left, to improving our schools, to building health, to improving international relations, and weakening nationalism, minimizing unfair discrimination, and perhaps above all, learning how to strengthen the family. Walter Lippman said just after the Cuban crisis, "As the Soviet Union and the United States come a little closer together and a little less ferocious in furthering a cold war, the world will become a much safer, but far more disorderly place." What we are saying in a sense can be epitomized by the statement from Proverbs, "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." We're getting now to the stage referred to by Pogo in the Walt Kelly cartoon which read, "We have met the enemy and they're us!"

To be specific, it would be well if there were a university-wide committee made up of representatives of the Board of Trustees, the college administration, a few members of the Alumni Association, and above all, students, whose job it might be in the next few months to look at the maps of the University of North Carolina to see what is going on from the residential point of view. In the future growth of the University, can't there be the kind of remodeling that will alter the isolation of some of the parts of the present university in such a way that it'll be the center of some new development? In the development of some cities, like Boston, the newest and best development is the one that was just a hole-in-the-ground fifteen years ago. Little by little, Boston has changed its face simply because we had some overall planning. Another thing that we have found very handy at MIT and Harvard is to have a visiting committee who will spend a day or two every once in a while looking at what is going on in the university. Visiting committees who are not used to this are surprised to see how much they can learn from the students' point of view. They respect the students more, and students respect them more.

I think of another specific thing that I tried at MIT. We had an organization there which had been going since 1902, a semi-secret organization, about which everybody knew but undergraduates soon forgot. It was a kind of honorary society of approximately fourteen juniors and seniors who met every other Tuesday night with the honorary members. We were all on a first-name basis. Although we talked about anything that we wanted to, we never made any decisions. It was just a question of an exchange of opinions and sometimes facts between the undergraduates, the administration, and a few alumni who had been members of the organization. It was one of the best channels of communication that I know of. It was looked upon with some suspicion by the student newspaper until the editors got elected to membership. If anyone got too anxious about it, they were informed about what was going on. I do not mean that something of that sort should be organized, but that it is advisable to have some institutional ways of having the students heard by more than just the faculty, administration, and Board of Trustees. We all have to be very patient in matters of this kind, although I don't believe that people are as afraid that we're going to take over the universities as they were a few years back. They find that we really are more benign and helpful than they thought at the beginning. But one of the rules is, when opposition develops, do not oppose in return. As the former Master of Trinity once said, "No one of us is infallible, not even the youngest of us." This has to be kept in mind.

GORDON ROHMAN: I'm just going to very briefly repeat what I said earlier, you can't beat being in existance. There is no substitute for it. Because we exist, with all of our imperfections, uncertainties, doubts, and errors, we are able to entertain high hopes of new possibilities. Without that, nothing. There is a sort of academic disease that goes under the name of planning. You can plan an idea to death. Now that is a kind of rationalization to put the best face on the matter. In our case, when we were enacted in a calendar year from an idea to a college, that's extraordinarily fast for any kind of bureaucracy, particularly an academic one. I don't counsel that kind of speed to anyone else, but one thing we had at the end of the calendar year was a college, launched and in existance. Somebody with a title and a budget and some students to respond to and a faculty and we were off and running. You can't top that! No amount of planning I think can really replace the bloody but also bloodied insight that you earn in this way, the sort of thing we're picking up now as we grow towards the future. I'll leave you with a word -- start!

Group Discussion

GORDON ROHMAN (in response to a query about how students are selected for Justin Morrill College): It's a self-selection process. The Guidelines say we are not to be an honors college, understood as a certain slicing of the gradepoint. We have simply set a quota of spaces available in the dormitories in our first years, and it's been a first come, first served selection. There is no particular requirement, other than admissability to the university. If a student satisfies that, he may then choose Justin Morrill. We'll probably ride with that until the day comes when we have, say, five applicants for every bed. We could still keep a first come, first served principle. What is primarily selecting students is the curriculum or their perception of the college. I don't know what these selecting factors are. There are certain words, however, like "small," which have a certain magic, indeed a sentimental appeal. "Experimental" usually attracts attention and a certain kind of audience. In a way, the defensive language attracts students. We are almost inevitably perceived by students, or at least by the high school counsellors who counsel the students, as a language college and so our means are construed as our end. We end up, I think, with more than our share of language majors. I don't know quite how we lick that one, but we are concerned that we not get ourselves trapped in an area of professional concern that distorts our entire image. We are in a process of trying to define ourselves better in the high schools, but I suspect that we are dealing with an insoluble problem there. You don't change the mind-set of high school counsellors by increasing the information you send out.

I'd like to ask Dr. Farnsworth about Harvard's health system and their athletic program. I've not been there, but I'm told that the Houses at Harvard have extremely good athletic programs, and that this in turn gives the student an additional orientation for his House and away from simply watching university athletics. I wonder whether, if this is true, that it might in some way apply to Chapel Hill's problems and the problems of many other areas where athletics are for the alumni primarily and also to give the students something to get excited about, but it's not very much a participating thing for most students.

DANA FARNSWORTH (in response to a question about the athletic program in the Harvard Houses): On the afternoon before the Yale-Harvard game, there are approximately 1,000 students participating in football and soccer games between the ouses and colleges of the two institutions. About 65% of all students participate in intermural athletics, some of the Houses have crews, all have football and basketball teams. This certainly does spread participation in athletics around a great deal. I don't think it diminishes the interest in intercollegiate athletics, but certainly it keeps it in balance. We don't have athletic scholarships, but scholarships for people who need money. If the person is a good athlete and gets a scholarship, but doesn't choose to go out, that's his business and nobody else's. The athletic program in the Houses does a great deal to develop house spirit, and to keep athletics in perspective for the students.

DANA FARNSWORTH (in response to a question about the importance of some faculty living in residence halls): I think it is quite essential. The only people who live in the Houses are the Master and his family, and the senior tutor and his family, and he, in effect, is the dean of students. There are in some rooms occasionally available three or four resident tutors, but the great majority are non-resident tutors who have office space there intermittantly. We also have another group called the Associates. I belong to Winthrope House, for example, and we get a free meal every week (if we can get there that often), pay $10.00 a year dues, go to the Christmas parties, and are available for a variety of things. In this way they get to see people of all ages and people from other schools of the university and I think this is quite important. I suppose it's expensive, but certainly it is something worth considering. Where the house system does not exist, but they're moving slowly in that direction, they will carve a suite for the faculty member and his family in the dormitories, and this serves as one more focus for exchange back and forth. I don't think that in a system like that it's good for a faculty member to spend too long in such a place, but three or four years makes a very good experience.

Some of the houses at Harvard are well sound-proofed, and some are not. They are arranged in such a way that the faculty residents don't feel that they are living in the midst of a student dormitory, except that if they are quite good they will have a lot of calls on them and will have to work up some system whereby they can get some privacy. Some have a system that when the front light is on, callers are welcome; when the front light is off, that means they are taking a snooze, or working on a speech. Most of the house masters have to work out ways and means of preserving their own privacy a part of the time.

GORDON ROHMAN: I don't think residential faculty are necessarily indispensable to running a residential college. Justin Morrill has most of the advantages of a person's being there without actually sleeping there. Faculty are there almost any time of the day or evening and weekend one way or another. So we get just about everything that a living-in faculty would provide except actually bedding down there from midnight to 8:00 o'clock, without running into the problem of expense or the other sociological problem that it is perhaps a little difficult to get some faculty -- at least married men with families -- to live in a student housing situation. So I think you could get along without it and have most of the advantages that are assumed to go with that system. At least it's been true in our experience. I wouldn't allow that kind of consideration to be a hang-up.

WILLIAM FIELDS, Dean of Students at the University of Massachusetts (in reply to a request for a description of the Orchard Hill residential college): Our enterprise was established under much the same atmosphere as has been suggested, with four buildings each housing 322 students. Each building happened to have two apartments and a lounge on each floor, just the size to take a Freshman English session. A group of faculty became interested, discussed it, and got the administrators and students together for conversation. They agreed that we should go ahead with something involving the faculty and extra class life of students, and quickly appointed a distinguished professor of English as Master of this complex. We took four apartments that had been tentatively set aside for residence staff and assigned them to resident faculty members recruited by the Master. These resident faculty members were for the most part single because the apartments were single-size. At the same time, they scheduled into the residence hall many sections of normal freshman courses. The Master found four faculty members, one for each of the four houses, who became responsible for the academic programming of that house, and they recruited some eight to ten additional faculty members as Fellows of the house to be associated with the program. We are now completing the fourth year of the Orchard Hill experiment. All is certainly not joy and success, but most of the original faculty are still with us, and the Master and original percepters are largely there. There's no thought of reducing the activity. We gradually found that even without curricular freedom, since we had only a minor seminar course involving interdisciplinary work, a great deal of programming has developed with student and faculty involved. Though I can't prove the grade point averages are higher, they are. I can't prove the dropout rate is lower, I'm not sure it is. I can say that the general climate is such that when Southwest, another residence college at the University of Massachusetts, was established, there was no question about trying to pursue a somewhat different model based than this. I think the University of Masachusetts is an indication of what a poverty pocket in higher education can do in this area.

DANA FARNSWORTH (in reply to a question about how much one man, a College Master, can do in setting the style of life in a residence college): Our studies have shown that when there is a contrast between a composite style of the whole staff and the Master, the Master takes precedence. One man is stronger than all the staff. The role of a Master who really becomes identified with the house is quite strong, not because of any manipulation on his part, but just because he tends to set a style and gives a sense of meaning to the whole thing. I don't know what it is, perhaps charisma of sorts. One of the student commencement speakers at Harvard commented that it is very difficult to tell men from monuments around there. I think role models are terribly important and House Masters can exercise a lot of influence.

NEVITT SANFORD (in response to a question about visitation regulations in residence halls): I was intending to touch on this earlier today when I spoke about the different cultures that prevail in different places. If you look at this situation nationally, you will find an enormous range with respect to the degree of liberalism with which this sort of thing is managed. But it's not just regional either because if you take the nine campuses of the University of California, they range all the way from Ervine, where at the beginning the decision was made that dormitory life was to be run by students and they could do anything they pleased, except tamper with the curriculum, to the other extreme at Santa Barbara and Berkeley. Believe it or not, Berkeley has been the most conservative of the several campuses of the University of California, except in Santa Barbara, where only now are they permitting any visiting in dormitory rooms. It was announced only three days ago by the Dean that there will now be a certain amount of visitation at certain hours with open doors. What makes the difference is extremely complicated. It is particularly important to know how at a given campus you get change in this matter. I suppose the problem is really that people from quite different backgrounds arrive at the same college, some ready for self-determination in this matter and others not. At Stanford, it's really quite remarkable that there was almost no visitation in rooms in 1961 when I was there. Now there's a lot, for it's gradually been liberalized. What is happening is that freshmen arriving at Stanford are increasingly sophisticated; they've already had a lot of freedom at high school. The seniors take hold and put the questions in such a way as to get the freshmen to agree that they are ready for a great deal of open housing. At Stanford it has worked very well and made no difference in respect to behaviour. It's simply a recognition of the kind of culture that exists. These are very mature students for the most part and they are very highly developed already; they're self-determined and nobody worries too much about them. But I know other campuses in which I would be extremely reluctant to go as far in that direction because the majority of the young people are not ready for it. For example, the case of introducing drinking on campus at Stanford: it made no difference in the behaviour except that everybody felt relaxed about it. But I know another place, a college in the middle of the country, where the president, a man ahead of his time, had the idea that alcohol could be much more managed if they'd legalize it right then and there. They did and chaos insued. The students acted as if all of a sudden all these forbidden fruits were available to them. Everybody had to have a cocktail party every day. Students were walking around the campus with glasses and bottles in their hands, showing thereby that they were totally unready for this kind of freedom. As a general principle, we ought to approach all these issues with the fundamental question of what would best advance the education of these particular students, i.e., what will best advance the process by which students become their own authority. In general, students, particularly freshmen, are quite ready to escape freedom. They will find authoritarian ways of solving these problems, happy to have groups make decisions for them, even to have deans make decisions for them. The educational problem is how to get students to surrender their external authorities, which often will be the social groups, and to develop so that they become their own authority. Now this will not happen very well if there is more freedom than they are prepared for. And it certainly won't happen at all if they don't have enough freedom. They become mature as they make more and more of their own decisions. The principle is in general the same, but you have to judge the circumstances in particular places at particular times. It's obvious that in general the country over, everything is moving in a liberalizing direction. But in different places, the pace will have to be different.

SAM HILL: Surely this conference confirms and highlights what we have all basically known all along, that is, we can't make it without each other. We're all in this together.

Four things have come across to me. First, the simplicity of this theory and indeed of its practice. Pardon me for de-dignifying, de-sophisticating, de-urbanizing, but this is all terribly simple. What we have been talking about is on the order of common sense. Universities have been out of touch with social realities. Maybe we're about to get back in touch. The second point which comes across to me is how religious all of this is. You expect that of a professor of religion. Everyone else has been himself and candid. Grant me that privilege. This has been very religious in the sense of "what binds together" and that basically is what "religious" means. This has also been "religious" in the sense of what matters ultimately. I think that's what we've been talking about. The third point that has come across to me -- and this, unlike the first two points, pains me profoundly -- is that our university psychiatrist, Cliff Reifler, has been right for years! He has been saying that his reason for being on virtually every committee of importance on the University of North Carolina campus, and for showing up here and there is by way of practicing preventative medicine. I wouldn't put it that way, but I know what he means and I think he's right. The fourth point which comes across to me is that the stakes are high in all this. We are barely able to capitalize on what we surely must know at our best to be true. i.e. that it's time for change, it's time for implementation of humane values, it's time to get back in touch with social reality. May I offer the historical observation that by now in this country, official university structures are secure enough to allow for change? Universities in this country have been in the crisis of identity since about 1869. Now there is status, we don't have to prove our value or legitimacy to anyone. Now there is money, we don't have to fight and scrap between departments and schools for enough finances to make out. The modern university's identity crisis seems to be nearing an end, at least in principle. Perhaps now we can turn to fundamental values for which we ought always to have been standing. What are the stakes? Lives, society, and civilization. It's not enough to prevent destruction of life, though our moral theories have largely focused on preventing destruction. We must also now construct, expand, and enhance. You by your coming, and all of us together, have driven ourselves to action. The theory which we have been discussing evokes action. Endless further discussion is uncongenial to the theory at hand. I would like to be able to say in closing that we have realized our intention of exploiting you. We haven't yet, but give us a little time. This conference is adjourned.

SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSIONS

Five Discussion Groups met on Saturday morning and afternoon, each numbering about twenty to twenty-five participants and consisting of students, faculty, and administrators from the participating institutions. The groups met for about one hour each time. The following account is based on the reports of the five reporters and recapitulates the main issues which emerged in the five groups.

Discussion dealt with several types of topics. First, there were questions, criticisms, and misgivings about the present traditional structure of the university -- an attempt to say what is wrong with the non-residential college approach to education. Points mentioned included the impersonality of the classroom, the lack of relevance of the subject matter, and the lack of personal contact between students and faculty. Second, several groups gave time to a discussion of the theories and assumptions behind residential colleges. These include the idea that education should be "holistic" (i.e. should provide for social and recreational needs as well as intellectual), and that students' needs and requests should be the basis of the educational structures and offerings. Understandably, most of the comments made were in agreement with these assumptions, though some questions and objections were raised. Third, considerable time was spent in these discussions in hearing statements from representatives of schools other than the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill describe their own attempts at residential colleges. Fourth, and of most importance here, were the specific questions and issues about residential colleges which were touched upon in almost every one of the discussion groups. The most relevant of these are as follows:

1. One question implicit or explicit in all of the discussions was whether there is any one residential college plan which constitutes the ideal, or even the essential, and which should be imitated by any university attempting to establish a residential college. The answer to this seems to be "No," largely because every university begins from some starting point which has built-in strengths and weaknesses, and this makes certain paths of development relatively easy and others almost impossible. Each university, then, must listen to and be guided by the experience of others, but must try to find that plan for implementing residential colleges which best fits its own needs, capitalizing on its assets, and minimizing its own difficulties.

2. Most of the groups discussed the question of how essential coeducation is to the success or failure of the residential college, and of the main ways coeducation should be sought. The various groups did not fully agree on this question, some feeling that coeducation is an essential part of the residential college plan, others saying that it is desirable but not essential. It was generally felt that coeducation in the classroom was not enough, and that social and living facilities should in some way be made coeducational. Several plans for doing this were discussed, and one that received considerable favorable comment was the building of residence halls consisting of two "towers," one for men and the other for women, joined by common eating and social facilities on the ground floor.

3. It was generally felt that greater personal contact with faculty members is one of the prime aims of the residential college system. Various opinions were expressed as to how much faculty contact is necessary, and how it is best and most feasibly achieved. The ideas of having faculty offices in the residence halls and of having some dinner sessions or after-class lunch sessions with faculty members were discussed and endorsed. On the question of the faculty members' living in the residence halls, it was generally felt that a certain amount of this is good, but by no means necessary to the success of a residential college. Some faculty members who would be willing to support the residential college plan in other ways would not or could not live in the halls.

4. Several questions were raised about the relation of the residential college to curriculum, but few concrete answers emerged. One question dealt with was whether it is desirable to build a residential college around a certain curriculum. No clear answer to this was given, but it seems to have been looked on as a mixed blessing, and several difficulties were mentioned. It was generally agreed that merely having some sections of certain classes meet

in a residential college is an incomplete and unimaginative answer to the question of relating curriculum to the residential college system. It was also pointed out that non-laboratory courses seem better suited to a residence hall situation, and that this raises the question of how the pre-medical or pre-dental student might be given any real place in a residential college, or at least in its curricular aspect.

5. As noted above, it was generally agreed that there can and probably should be considerable variation of types and emphases among residential colleges. Physical facilities, the desires of the students, even the general nature of the university, dictate that several different types of residential colleges might be sought, and that different types might even coexist on the same campus. This may to some extend answer the previous questions about the importance of coeducation, faculty involvement, and curricular adaptation. A given residential college might maximize or minimize any of these factors. It was also pointed out that no university should try to convert itself entirely to the residential college system, for students should have the option of completely avoiding the residential college system if that is their wish.

In conclusion, it was generally felt that every university must develop its own plan for residential colleges, based on its own desires, capacities, and limitations. It was also generally agreed that the questions of coeducation, faculty participation, and curricular change can be handled in a variety of ways and that no one of these need be regarded as essential to a residential college system.

CONFERENCE LEADERSHIP

Principle Speakers

NEVITT SANFORD received his formal training at the University of Richmond, A.B., Columbia, M.A., and Harvard, Ph.D in psychology in 1934. He served as staff psychologist in several Massachusetts institutions between 1932 and 1940. Since 1940 Dr. Sanford has been a resident of California where from 1940 to 1961 he served on the faculty of the University of California at Berkeley and in adjunct research positions. From 1961 to the present he has served at Stanford University where he is Professor of Psychology and Education and Director for the Institute for the Study of Human Problems. The chief areas of his interest are personality development, personality and social attitudes, and psychoanalysis. Among the publications for which he is responsible in one way or another are *Physique, Personality and Scholarship*, *The Authoritarian Personality*, *The American College*, *Self and Society*, *College and Character*, and *Where Colleges Fail*.

DANA L. FARNSWORTH is a native of West Virginia who was educated at West Virginia University and Harvard. He holds honorary degrees from Salem College, Williams College, Lesley College, and Notre Dame. He has served as assistant director of health at Williams College, 1935-1945, and director from 1945 to 1946; as professor and medical director of Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1946-1954; and was acting dean of students from 1950-1951. Since 1954 he has been Henry K. Oliver Professor of Hygiene and Director of the University Health Services at Harvard University. The chief areas of his interest include the application of psychiatry to education, reactions of college students to social systems, the effects of stress, and community mental health programs. In addition to several books, including *Psychiatry, Education, and the Young Adult*, he is the author of numerous articles on adolescence and university psychiatry.

D. GORDON ROHMAN received his A.B., M.A., and Ph.D degrees from Syracuse University. After a brief stint in newspaper and public relations work, he taught at Syracuse University, Hamilton College and Michigan State, where he was director of liberal education for the adult program. Since 1965 he has been Dean of Justin Morrill College at Michigan State University, one of the most exciting residential college programs in the nation.

Other Leaders

John Charles Morrow, III	Dean, College of Arts and Sciences and the General College, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
C. O. Cathey	Dean, Student Affairs, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Glen Elder	Associate Professor of Sociology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Daniel Patterson	Associate Professor of English, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Discussion Leaders	Reporters
Dr. Gifford G. Hale	Dr. William Eastman
Dr. Lee Upcraft	Dr. Weldon Thornton
Dr. John A. Hunt	Dr. Harry E. Smith
Dean Doris Seward	Dean James O. Cansler
Dr. David N. Hess	Dr. Lillian Y. Lehman

THE CHANCELLOR'S COMMITTEE ON THE RESIDENTIAL COLLEGE SYSTEM

Samuel S. Hill, Jr., Professor and Chairman, Department of Religion* (Chairman)

George A. Kennedy, Professor and Chairman, Department of Classics

Lillian Y. Lehman, Visiting Associate Professor of Zoology

Kenneth Joseph Reckford, Associate Professor of Classics

Clifford B. Reifler, Senior Psychiatrist, The Health Service; Assistant Professor of Psychiatry* (Conference Coordinator)

Weldon Thornton, Associate Professor of English

Lew Brown, Senior Student; House Advisor in Morehead College; Former President Mens' Residence Council; Member of Residence College Commission of Student Government*

Jed Dietz, Junior Student; Vice-President of Student Body; Speaker, Student Legislature

Parker Hudson, Senior Student; Governor of Morrison Residence College

Marcy Kerney, Senior Student; Member, Residence College Commission of Student Government; Car[illegible] Women's Council; Activity Chairman, McIver House

Sharon Rose, Senior Student; President of Women's Residence Council

Ex Officio Members:

James O. Cansler, Assistant Dean of Student Affairs and Dean of Men*
Katherine K. Carmichael, Dean of Women
Harry E. Smith, Presbyterian Campus Chaplain (United Campus Ministry)*
Frederick W. Schroeder, Associate Dean of Men* (Secretary)

* The Conference Committee

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Stephen H. Ackerman
Dept. of Foreign Languages, USC
4141 Pinehaven Court
Columbia, S. C. 29205

E. Maynard Adams
Philosophy Dept., UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Mrs. John Alcott
301 Chase Avenue
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Sharon E. Adams
Student, College of Education
University of Kentucky, Box 91
Lexington, Ky.

Dwight W. Allen
306 Graham, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C., 27514

Richard C. Armstrong
Director of Housing, Univ. Ga.
305 Greencrest Dr.
Athens, Ga. 30601

David G. Basile
Professor, Geography, UNC
Mason Farm Rd.
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Robert R. Bass
1101 Granville Towers, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Raymond C. Bice
Dean, Univ. of Va.
1720 King Mountain Rd.
Charlottesville, Va. 22901

Benjamine F. Blakewood
950 Morrison, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Richard T. Blackwell
411 Morrison, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Herbert L. Bodman, Jr.
Professor, History, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Lew G. Brown
105 Stacy, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Paige R. Buehholz
214 N. Spenser Hall, UNC-G
Greensboro, N. C. 27412

James O. Cansler
Dean of Men, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Katherine K. Carmichael
Dean of Women, UNC
C-2, Graham Court Apts.
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Joel J. Carter
Professor, Music, UNC
601 Laurel Hill Rd.
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Cornelius O. Cathey
Dean of Student Affairs, UNC
302 Country Club Rd.
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Sidney Cohn
Dept. of City and Regional Planning, UNC
306 Ransom Street
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Bonnie E. Cone
Vice-Chancellor, UNC-Charlotte
2137 Sharon Rd.
Charlotte, N. C. 28207

Mrs. O. M. Couch
Professor, N. C. College
2211 Apex Highway
Durham, N. C.

John R. Curtis
Psychiatrist, Univ. of Ky.
711 Kirkland Dr.
Lexington, Ky.

Charles R. Darby
Psychologist, Univ. of Ga.
775 Riverhill Dr.
Athens, Ga. 30601

William C. Darrah
Student, Univ. of Mass.
North Street
Mattapoisett, Mass. 02739

James A. Devereux
Professor, English, UNC
211 McCauley St.
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Jed E. Dietz
411 Morrison, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Helen T. Dorobiala
300 Whitehead, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Zane E. Eargle
Assoc. Professor, Education, UNC
3445 Sheridan Dr.
Durham, N. C.

William F. Eastman
Asst. Professor, Marriage Counselling
236 Hayes Road
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Glen H. Elder, Jr.
Assoc. Professor, Sociology, UNC
120 S. Boundary
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Robert A. Farris, Jr.
321 B S. Greensboro St.
Student, UNC
Carrboro, N. C.

A. D. Frazier, Jr.
Housemaster, UNC
Apartment, James Residence College
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Karen Lynne Freeman
906 Granville, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Michael V. Fromhart
Clinical Psychologist, Duke
Colonial Apts. 69-B
Durham, N. C. 27707

Barbara Ann Gaddy
311 Winston, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Jack Leonard Geren
Director, Residence Halls
University of Alabama
129 Friedman Hall
University, Alabama

Harold A. Gibbard
Professor, Sociology, W. Va. Univ.
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Banks O. Godfrey, Jr.
Chaplain, Wesley Foundation
103 N. Street, Court
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Gifford G. Hale
Professor, College of Ed., Fla. State
2409 Miranda Ave.
Tallahassee, Fla. 32304

John Rice Halsell, III
Chaplain, Duke Univ.
1727 Euclid Rd.
Durham, N. C.

Howard D. Henry
Director, Graham Memorial, UNC
210 Marilyn Lane
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

David N. Hess
West Va. University
Rt. 4, Box 98
Morgantown, W. Va. 26505

Mary G. Hightower
230 Nurses' Dorm, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Samuel S. Hill, Jr.
Department of Religion, UNC
14 Rolling Road
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Edwin F. Harris, Jr.
Facilities Planning Div., N.C. State
Raleigh, N. C.

Rutherford C. Harris
Student, Univ. of Georgia
320 N. Church St.
Winterville, Ga. 30683

George R. Holcomb
Dean, Research Administration, UNC
302 Burlage Circle
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Samuel M. Holton
Professor, Education, UNC
411 Holly Lane
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Herbert Horowitz
Professor, Wake Forest Univ.
1099 Foxhall Dr.
Winston-Salem, N. C. 27106

John M. Howell
Professor, East Carolina
132 E. Longmeadow
Greenville, N. C. 27834

Frank Parker Hudson, Jr.
413 Morrison, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

John A. Hunt
Professor, English, U. Mass.
Box 181, RR # 1
Belchertown, Mass. 01007

Ray C. Hunt, Jr.
Assoc. Comptroller, U. Va.
312 East Monacan Dr.
Charlottesville, Va. 22901

Elizabeth Ann Idol
201 Winston Dorm, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Nish Jamgotch, Jr.
Dept. of Political Science, UNC-C
Charlotte, North Carolina

Donald C. Jicha
Assoc. Professor, Chemistry, UNC
2117 N. Lakeshore Drive
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Robert L. Johnson
Vice-President, Univ. of Kentucky
3409 Belvoir Drive
Lexington, Ky. 40502

Marcia J. Kearney
321 McIver, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

A. S. Knowles
Professor, English, N. C. State U.
3403 Leonard St.
Raleigh, N. C. 27607

Steve Reed Knowlton
243 James, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Robert Krueger
English Dept., Duke
Duke University
Durham, N. C. 27706

Jimmy R. Lakey
Student, Univ. of Alabama
P. O. Box 4897
University, Ala. 35486

Lillian Lehman
Assoc. Professor, Zoology, UNC
7 Rogerson Drive
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Dorothea C. Leighton
Professor, School of Public Health, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Charles Freeman Longino, Jr.
Professor, Sociology, UNC
39 Davie Circle
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Donald M. MacKay
Dean of Students, UNC-Charlotte
6508 Spring Garden Lane
Charlotte, N. C. 28213

Clifford K. Madsen
Professor, School of Music
Florida State University
Talahassee, Fla.

Robert L. McAdams
Acting Dean of Men, N. C. College
2805 Apex Highway
Durham, N. C.

Dershie B. McDivitt
Asst. Dean of Women, UNC
506 North Street
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Rosemary McGee
Dean of Women, UNC-G
Greesnboro, N. C. 27403

Joel C. McGurk
Asst. Dean of Men, Wm. and Mary
Apt. 2 B, 415 York St.
Williamsburg, Va.

Thomas A. McLeod
Asst. Dean of Men, U. of Ala.
P. O. Box 4775
University, Ala.

John C. Morrow, III
Professor, Chemistry, UNC
420 Brookside Dr.
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Perry Howard Moser
Student, UNC-C
5439 Elizabeth Road
Charlotte, N. C. 28213

Heather H. Ness
Box 9346, Duke Station
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Jerrold Orne
Librarian, UNC
529 Dogwood Dr.
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Harold T. Parker
Professor, Duke Univ.
923 Dacian Ave.
Durham, N. C. 27701

Elizabeth Ann Parr
Student, Michigan State University
125 Phillips
East Lansing, Mich. 48823

Daniel W. Patterson
Assoc. Professor, English, UNC
818 Old Pittsboro Rd.
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Kenneth Joseph Reckford
Assoc. Professor, Classics, UNC
729 E. Franklin St.
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Sharon L. Rose
219 Whitehead Dorm, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Janet Elizabeth Sawyer
318 Whitehead, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Andrew MacKay Scott
Professor, Political Science, UNC
1028 Highland Woods
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Ann F. Scott
Professor, History, Duke University
1028 Highland Woods
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Doris M. Seward
Dean of Student Affairs
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Ky. 40506

O. Suthern Sims
Acting Dean of Students, Univ. of Ga.
550 Greencrest Dr.
Athens, Ga. 30601

Harry E. Smith
Campus Chaplain, United Campus Ministry
208 Vance Street
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Tommie Lou Smith
Assoc. Academic Dean, UNC-G
206 Kemp Rd. East
Greensboro, N. C. 27401

Carl D. Stout
Student, East Carolina Univ.
3513 N. Jefferson St.
Arlington, Va. 22207

Benjamine Loyall Taylor, Jr.
206 Teague, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Weldon Thornton
Assoc. Professor, English, UNC
57 Dogwood Acres
Chapel Hill, N. C.

Robert Moore Travis
President, Student Body, UNC
212 Graham Memorial
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

David Arnold Travland
Dept. of Psychology, Wake Forest U.
Colonial Estates Apts. # 5
Winston-Salem, N. C.

James H. Tucker
East Carolina University
1109 S. Overlook Drive
Greenville, N. C. 27834

Arthur N. Tuttle, Jr.
Director, UNC Planning Office
86 Maxwell Road
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

M. Lee Upcraft
Director of Student Relations
Justin Morrill
1341 Bayshore Drive
Haslett, Mich.

James E. Wadsworth
Director of Housing, UNC
Wilson Court
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Norbert B. Watts
Director of Student Housing
N. C. State Univ.
Rt. 8, Box 183
Raleigh, N. C. 27607

Chelsea Cook White
Student, Florida State
608 W. Lafayette St., Apt # 2
Talahassee, Fla. 32304

Sharon A. Willis
215 Whitehead Dorm, UNC
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Gerald Lee Wilson
Assistant Dean, Duke University
18-H Valley Terrace Apts.
Durham, N. C. 27707

Robert N. Wilson
Professor, Mental Health, UNC
204 Glenburnie St.
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

Charles H. Witten
Vice-President, University of S. C.
427 Harden St.
Columbia, S. C. 29205

David S. Zinn
Student, West Va. University
Box 137
Reedsville, W. Va. 26547

THE DEVELOPING RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

The needs of the student in the mass university have been of mounting concern in recent years. As the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill grew in size and complexity, many problems attendant upon mass registration, mass classes and mass housing became increasingly apparent. In student housing it was apparent that students felt a growing anonymity as high-rise residence halls were built within which they could easily become lost.

One of the first efforts undertaken to assist residence hall men in adjusting to their academic life began in 1957 when five graduate students were appointed as Resident Counselors and assigned to work in Cobb Hall. Their function was to counsel with students and to be available to assist them in every way possible. The program was sufficiently successful to encourage the establishment of a Resident Counselor Program in the Lower Quadrangle -- Graham, Aycock, Lewis, Everett, and Stacy Halls. Fifteen graduate students were appointed to serve as Resident Counselors for the year 1958-59.

By 1960 it was apparent that the men's residence hall personnel situation needed additional improvement. At that time eighteen Resident Advisors worked in certain residence halls in addition to the fifteen Resident Counselors mentioned above. In each of the men's residence halls there was also a Dormitory Manager who distributed keys and checked on such matters as property destruction and the general maintenance of the buildings. This arrangement was changed by merging the Resident Advisor and the Resident Counselor programs, eliminating the Dormitory Manager program and appointing a graduate or professional student as a Head Resident Advisor. The University appointed non-residential managers of the dormitories (full-time non-student employees) with responsibility for regular building inspections.

By the fall of 1963 increasing concern for the well being of students in residence halls resulted in the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Residence Halls, composed of representatives of as many facets of the University community as possible.

By early May, 1964, it was clear that some form of decentralization and the subsequent creation of cluster or area residential units was desirable, and the term "residential college" entered into the vocabulary of the committee with increasing frequency.

The committee decided to consider informally particular geographic areas of the campus as "residential colleges" and to institute certain programs and procedures which might reenforce the development of such colleges:

1. Arrangements were made to place freshmen in common Modern Civilization sections so as to make it possible for roommates and friends across the hall to be in the same course and to have the same teacher. For many students this would prove to be a unique experience and would probably constitute the only time during their entire academic career when they would be taking a common course.

2. The YMCA planned to develop a rotating faculty speaker program to begin in the fall of 1964.

3. Intramural managers were to be paid a salary equivalent to their room rent, and the intramural program was to be developed on an area basis so that teams from the residence halls in a particular cluster would compete with each other.

4. The Men's Residence Council (The Inter-Dormitory Council has renamed itself late in the fall of 1963 as a direct result of conversations which took place in the Ad Hoc Committee) decided to conduct social activities on an area basis rather than on an all-campus scale.

5. The various chaplains associated with the University were invited to accept assignments to specific areas as collateral activities to their normal functions as representative of their church. It was understood from the beginning that they would operate on an inter-denominational basis primarily toward the end of serving as advisors to residents in the college.

6. The residential advisors program administered by the Office of the Dean of Men was reorganized so as to focus more upon the residence halls by areas.

From this point on a major impetus was the enthusiasm of the students. After being petitioned by two areas desiring to become pilot projects, Chancellor Paul F. Sharp designated Scott and Morehead as pilot residential colleges. Concurrently with this development, students in Craige, a seven story high-rise men's residence hall, worked together toward the creation of a collective identity. Thus "Maverick House" sprang into being as an organization having many of the characteristics of the other two projects.

Twenty-five students and twenty-five members of the faculty and the administration attended a conference on residential colleges in December, 1964, which further clarified the concept of the residential colleges and their potential.

Two policies instituted in September 1964 contributed to the general success of the initial year of residential college activity. First, deferred rush became an actuality. For the first time freshman men were not permitted to join fraternities until the beginning of the second semester and then only if they had achieved a 2.0 academic average based upon the 4.0 system. Second, entering freshman men were living in the residence halls; none of them were preoccupied with fraternity rush or activities as freshman fraternity pledges. Readily, they turned toward the social, athletic, political and academic programs in their residence units.

The academic year 1965-1966 saw the completion of the initial establishment of all of the residential colleges and the beginning of interest in a closer relation between the men's and women's residence halls. Freshman orientation groups were based on the floors on which students lived.

The first residential college at UNC, Scott College, was officially dedicated in October 1965, and during the following month the Chancellor designated the five remaining residential areas as provisional residential colleges. The men living in these colleges overwhelmingly passed a referendum which increased their social fee to permit funds to be available to the new colleges and their houses. Following the financial referendum all of the residential colleges drew up constitutions. By June, 1966, all of the constitutions had cleared and been adopted.

The Men's Residence Council, composed of the Governors, Lieutenant Governors, and the Senate of each residential college, reconstituted itself to serve as the coordinating agency for all the residential colleges. The Men's Residence Council Court was developed to provide judicial handling of infractions of residence college rules.

Up to this point residential colleges had been exclusively a male concern. However, by the end of the spring semester of 1966, by individual arrangements with women's residence halls, four informal coed colleges had been created.

During the summer of 1966 Granville Towers, a privately owned residential complex operated as a business venture in accordance with University regulations, was completed and the residential complex opened on a coeducational basis, with women living in one tower and men in the other. The men's tower is organized as Granville Residential College with each floor serving as one house of the college. Women in the other tower have a considerable interest in the college, and there is a very close working relationship with it. All residents in both towers are required to take meals in the Commons located between them, and the resulting social interchange leads naturally toward the evolution of a de facto coeducational residential college.

Although a number of faculty members have visited in the residential colleges and have given informal talks there, considerable concern has been expressed by students, faculty, and administrators over the apparent lack of intellectual and academic content in the residential colleges. In the fall of 1966 Chancellor J. Caryle Sitterson appointed an Advisory Committee on Residential Colleges to advise him on the direction these movements toward improving the quality of residential life at the University should take. Convinced that one barrier to the development of a truly viable residential college system at the University of North Carolina was the lack of information on the part of many members of the university community, faculty, students, and administrators alike, the Advisory Committee planned the conference reported herein.

The conference had the desired effect in Chapel Hill during the academic year following the conference (1967-68). Chancellor Sitterson appointed Dr. Harry E. Smith as Special Assistant for Residential College Development, and approved two pilot programs, one involving the formal development of a co-educational residential college, and both having Faculty Fellows. Faculty offices, seminar rooms, and classrooms have been made available in these residential colleges and a number of experiments are in process there.

As these proceedings go to press there are eight residential areas with varying degrees of organization as residential colleges. Two are coeducational. One of these and one of the men's colleges have official Faculty Fellows and the others have informal arrangements with faculty. All of the colleges have classes taught within them (a total of 31 sections) which are largely composed of the residents of the particular college. Five women's halls and three men's halls remain outside this structure for those students who do not wish to be part of a residential college. A diversity of styles of life and of means of integrating living and learning are thus developing on campus.

Just what final form the residential colleges at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill will take is not presently clear. But the Chancellor's Advisory Committee is convinced that this concept holds exciting possibilities for innovation and humanization in higher education, and appreciates the part this conference played in enlarging our understanding of the residential college concept.